

INTRODUCTION TO THE MASSORETICO-CRITICAL EDITION

HEBREW BIBLE

OF THE

 \mathbf{BY}

CHRISTIAN D. GINSBURG

INTRODUCTION TO THE

MASSORETICO-CRITICAL EDITION

Table of	contents.
----------	-----------

rait i. — The Outer Form of the Text	
Preface	
Chap I. — The Order of the Books	1-8
Chap II. — The Sectional Divisions of the Text (the Open and Closed Sections)	9-24
Chap III. — The Division into Chapters	25-31
Chap IV. — The Sedarirm; or Triennial Pericopes	32-65
Chap V. The Parashivoth: or Annual Pericopes	66-67
Chap VI. — The Divisions into Verses	68-107
Chap VII. — The Number of the Words	108-113
Chap VIII. The Number of the Letters	113

INTRODUCTION TO THE MASSORETICO-CRITICAL EDITION

Table of contents.

Table of Contents (Continued)

(Continued)	
I. Mikra Sopherim	308
II. Itur Sopherim	308
III. Words Read which are not Written in the Text	309
IV. Words Written in Text, but cancelled in Reading	315
V. The Fifteen Extraordinary Points	318
VI. The Suspended Letters	334
VII. The Inverted Nuns	341
VIII. The Removal of IndelicateExpressions and Anthropomorphisms, &c., from the Text	345
IX. The Emendations of the Sopherim	349
X. Impious Expressions towards the Almighty	363
XI. The Safeguarding of the Tetragrammaton	367
XII. The attempt to Remove the Application of the Names of False Gods to Jehovah	399
XIII. Safeguarding the Unity of Divine Worship at Jerusalem	404

Chap. XII. — The History and Description of the Manuscripts . 469-778

Chap. XIII. — The History of the Printed Text 779-976

977

983

1000

1001

1003

INTRODUCTION TO THE MASSORETICO-CRITICAL EDITION

Table of contents.

Table of Contents (Continued)

Appendices.

Appendix I. On the Closed Sections	

Appendix II. The *Dikduke Ha-Teamim* from the St. Petersburg MS. (A. D. 1009)

Appendix III.

Tables of Massorah, Magna and Parva

Appendix IV.

Specimen of the Revised Notes on the Pentateuch

Indexes.

I. Index of Manuscripts

• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	
II. Index of Printed Editions of the Hebrew Bible	1006

III Index of Subjects

III. Index of Subjects 1008

IV. Index of Persons 1016

V. Index of Principal Texts 1021

Tables.

I. Table of Manuscripts Described

II.Table of Printed Editions Described and Enumerated

VOLUME I

PREFACE.

The present Edition of the Hebrew Bible, to which this Volume is an Introduction, differs from all others in the following particulars:

THE TEXT.

- 1. The Text itself is based upon that of the *First* Edition of Jacob ben Chayim's Massoretic Recension, printed by Bomberg, at Venice, in the year 1524-5. Existing Hebrew Bibles, which profess to follow Jacob ben Chayim's text, have admitted in the course of years many unwarranted variations from it and many errors.
- 2. No variations, however strongly supported by Hebrew Manuscripts and Ancient Versions, are introduced into the Text itself, which has been compiled strictly in accordance with the Massorah collected from the Manuscripts.
- 3. All variations are relegated entirely to the margin.
- 4. While the modern divisions of chapters and verses are noted for the sake of convenience, the text is arranged according to the ancient chapters and

sectional divisions of the Massorah and the MSS., which are thus restored.

- 5. It uniformly reproduces the *Dageshed* and *Raphed* letters, which are found in all the best Massoretic Manuscripts, but which have been omitted in all the current printed editions of the Hebrew Bible.
- 6. The ancient Massoretic chapters, called *Sedarim*, are also indicated throughout in the margin against their respective places.

THE MARGIN.

- 7. It is well known that in the printed Texts the variations called *Kethiv* and *Keri* are marked by the word in the Text (*Kethiv*) having the vowel-points belonging to the word in the margin (*Keri*). This produces hybrid forms, which are a grammatical enigma to the Hebrew student. But in this Edition the words in the Text thus affected (*Kethiv*) are left *unpointed*, and in the margin the two readings are for the first time given with their respective vowel-points.
- 8. The margin contains the various readings of the different Standard codices which are quoted in the Massorah itself, but which have long since perished.
- 9. It gives the various readings found in the Manuscripts and Ancient Versions.
- 10. It gives the readings of the Eastern and Western Schools against those words which are affected by them; lists of which are preserved, and given in the Model Codices and in certain special Manuscripts.

- 11. It also gives, against the affected words, the variations between *Ben-Asher* and *Ben-Naphtali*, hitherto not indicated in the margin. These had been consigned to the end of the large Editions of the Bible which contain the Massorah of Jacob ben Chayim.
- 12. It gives, in some instances, readings of the Ancient Versions which are *not* supported by Manuscript authority.
- 13. It gives, for the first time, the class of various readings called *Sevirin* against every word affected by them. These *Sevirin* in many Manuscripts are given as the substantive textual reading, or as of equal importance with the offical *Keri*. These readings have been collected from numerous Manuscripts.

When compiling the notes to the Hebrew Bible, I at first gave the results of my collation without regard to the work of others who also profess to edit the Hebrew Text according to the Massorah. It was, however, pointed out to me that as sundry parts of Dr. Baer's edition of the text had been accepted by students as exhibiting the Massoretic recension, and since my edition differs in many respects from that of Dr. Baer, it was my duty to specify the authorities when my readings are in conflict with his. I acted upon this advice which accounts for the Notes in my edition of the Text being more extensive in the Prophets and the Hagiographa than in the Pentateuch. To remedy this inequality I have revised the notes to the Pentateuch in order to bring them into harmony with those of

the second and third Divisions of the Hebrew Bible. A specimen of the revised notes I give in Appendix IV.

In addition to my having read the proofs of the Hebrew Bible four times, they have also been twice read by the learned Dr. Mandelkern of Leipzig and once by the Rev. George Margoliouth of the Oriental Printed Books and MSS. Department in the British Museum. Mr. Margoliouth, moreover, revised and verified the references to the Ancient Versions of the Prophets and the Hagiographa, and it is to his careful revision that I am indebted for their accuracy, as well as for some valuable suggestions. The results of his revision of the notes on the Pentateuch I hope to embody in my revised notes.

That in spite of our united readings, some errors should still have been overlooked, those who have ever printed Hebrew with the vowel-points and the accents will easily understand and readily forgive. Some of these errors I have already detected, and some have been pointed out to me. These have duly been corrected in the stereotyped plates. The absolute correctness of such a text can only be secured in the process of time, and by the kindly aid of students. But whether pointed out in a friendly or in a hostile way, I shall be most grateful for such criticism.

To my friend the Rev. Dr. Bullinger, the learned secretary of the Trinitarian Bible Society 1 am entirely indebted for the elaborate Indices as well as for his help in reading the proofs.

PREFACE.

I cannot conclude this Preface without expressing my deep gratitude to the officials of the British Museum for the ready help I have received from them in the course of my work. But for the special privileges accorded to me by Sir Edward Maunde Thompson K.C.B., L.C.D., L.L.D. the Principal Librairia; Richard Garnett C.B., L.L.D., Keeper of Printed Books; and Robert K. Douglas, Keeper of Oriental Printed Books and MSS., I could not possibly have finished this Introduction and my other works within the span of life allotted to me.

Christian D. Ginsburg.

Holmlea, Virginia Water, Surrey November 5 1896.



Part I.

The Outer Form of the Text.

The principles by which I was guided in the preparation of this Massoretico-critical edition of the Hebrew Scriptures extend not only to the outer form, but to the condition of the text itself. The extensive changes, however, which these principles necessitated, are strictly in accordance with the Massoretic MSS., and the early editions of the Massoretic text. These deviations from the modern editions of the so-called Massoretic Hebrew Bibles I shall describe in detail.

Chap. I.

The order of the Books.

The most ancient record with regard to the sequence of the books in the Hebrew Scriptures is that given in the Babylonian Talmud. Passing over the *Pentateuch*, about which there never has been any doubt, it is here laid down on the highest authority that the order of the *Prophets* is as follows: Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Isaiah and the Minor Prophets; whilst that of the *Hagiographa* is as follows: Ruth, Psalms, Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, Lamentations, Daniel, Esther, Ezra-Nehemiah and Chronicles. ¹

ישעיה יוחזקאל ישעיה ברק של נביאים ירמיה וווקאל ישעיה ברק של כביאים יוחזקאל ישעיה ושנים עשר..... מידרן של כתובים רות וספר תהילים ואיוב ומשלי קהלת שיר Comp. Baba Bathra 14b.

Nothing can be more explicit than the directions given in the canon before us as to the order of the books. Yet, the oldest dated Biblical MS. which has come to light deviates from this order. The St. Petersburg Codex which is dated A. D. 916 and which contains only the Latter Prophets has yet a List of all the Prophets, both Former and Latter, and in this List the order is given as follows: The Former Prophets — Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings; the Latter Prophets — Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and the Minor Prophets. Here, then, the sequence of the Latter Prophets is not that which is prescribed in the Talmud.

The next MS. in chronological order is the St. Petersburg Codex, dated A. D. 1009. As this MS. contains the whole Hebrew Bible, we see the discrepancy between the Talmudic Canon, and the actual order adopted by the Scribes to be still more glaring. We pass on from the Pentateuch and the Former Prophets, which never vary in their order, to the Latter Prophets and Hagiographa. In these divisions of the Hebrew Scriptures the sequence is as follows in this important MS.: Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, the Minor Prophets, Chronicles, Psalms, Job, Proverbs, Ruth, Song of Songs, Ecclesiastes, Lamentations, Esther, Daniel, Ezra-Nehemiah.² The difference, here, is most striking. What makes this deviation still more remarkable is the fact that the Grammatico-Massoretic Treatise entitled Adath Deborim (A. D. 1207) describes this order, as far as the Hagiographa are concerned, as the correct one, exhibiting the Western or Palestinian practice; and the order which places Chronicles or Esther at the end of this

¹ Comp. the Fac-simile edition by Professor Strack, fol. 224 a, St. Petersburg 1876.

² Katalog der hebräischen Bibelhandschriften der kaiserlichen öffentlichen Bibliothek in St. Petersburg von Harkavy und Strack, No. B, 19a, p. 263 etc., Leipzig 1875.

division as the Eastern or Babylonian practice, which is to be deprecated.1

The position, however, of Chronicles or Esther does not constitute the only variation in the order of the Hagiographa in the MSS. Besides these, there are also points of difference in the sequence of the Latter Prophets to which the notice in the Adath Deborim does not refer at all. To facilitate the comparison of the difference in the order of the books, both in the MSS. and in the early editions, it is necessary to state that for liturgical or ritual purposes the Pentateuch, together with the five Megilloth, has been transmitted separately in many Codices and in printed editions.

As the Megilloth, which are a constituent part of the Hagiographa, follow a different order in different MSS. as well as in some early editions; and moreover, as they do not appear again among the Hagiographa in those editions of the complete Bibles which place them after the Pentateuch, I must first describe their sequence when thus joined to the Pentateuch.² For this purpose I have collated the following nine MSS. of the Pentateuch with the Megilloth in the British Museum. (1) Add. 9400; (2) Add. 9403; (3) Add. 19776; (4) Harley 5706; (5) Add. 9404; (6) Orient. 2786; (7) Harley 5773; (8) Harley 15283, and (9) Add. 15282. These nine MSS. exhibit no fewer than four different orders for the five Megilloth, as will be seen

² For their sequence when they form their proper part of the Hagiographa, see the Table below, page 7.

¹ The important passage bearing upon this subject is given by Professor Track and is as follows: דע ישכילך האלהים כי זו התכת הכתובים יחלק א לקים: באלהים כי זו התכת הכתובים יחלק א קלות, קינות, אחשורוש, דניאל, דברי הימים, תהלות, איוב, משלי, רות, שיר השירים, קהלת, קינות, אחשורוש, הספר, עזרא, ואנשי ארץ שנער הכליפו זה התיקון, מקצתם שם אדם שת אנוש באחרית הספרים והוא ומקצתם שם מנלת אסתר באחרית הספר. עתה נתחיל בראשון מן אלה הספרים והוא ספר דברי הימים. על תקון ארץ ישראל, משום כי הוא התמים אשר ביד האמה, ואליו מופרי כתבי הקדש מן ארץ שנער ווולתה: Comp. Zeitschrift für die gesammte lutherische Theologie und Kirche, Vol. XXXVI, p. 605. Leipzig 1875.

from the subjoined Table, in which I give also in the fifth column the order adopted in the first, second and third editions of the Hebrew Bible, viz., Soncino 1488, Naples 1491-93, and Brescia 1492-94; as well as that of the second and third editions of Bomberg's Quarto Bible (Venice 1521 and 1525) in all of which the five Megilloth follow immediately after the Pentateuch.

The order of the Megilloth after the Pentateuch.

I	II	III	IV	V
MSS. Nos. 1, 2, 3	MSS. Nos. 4, 5, 6	MSS. Nos. 7, 8	MS. No. 9	Early Editions
Song of Songs	Esther	Ruth	Ruth	Song of Songs
Ruth	Song of Songs	Song of Songs	Song of Songs	Ruth
Lamentations	Ruth	Ecclesiastes	Lamentations	Lamentations
Ecclesiastes	Lamentations	Lamentations	Ecclesiastes	Ecclesiastes
Esther	Ecclesiastes	Esther	Esther	Esther

It will thus be seen that the early editions of the Hebrew Bible adopted unanimously the order exhibited in the first column. It is also to be remarked that the different sequences do not belong to different countries. The three MSS. which head the first column belong, respectively, to the German and Franco-German Schools. The three MSS. in the second column are German, Franco-German and Italian. The two in the third column are Italian and Spanish, whilst the one MS. at the head of the fourth column is of the German School.

The Latter Prophets.

As has already been stated, there is no difference in any of the MSS. or in the early editions with regard to the order of the Former Prophets. It is only in the Latter Prophets and in the Hagiographa where these variations obtain. In the Tabular exhibition of these variations I shall give separately the MSS., and the editions which I have collated for these two divisions, since the variations in the Latter Prophets are reduceable to three columns,

whilst those in the Hagiographa require no fewer than seven columns.

For the Latter Prophets I collated the following MSS. and early editions exhibiting the result in four columns:

- Col. I. (1) The Babylon Talmud; (2) MS. No. 1 National Library, Madrid, dated A. D. 1280; (3) Orient. 1474; (4) Oriental 4227; and (5) Add. 1545. These have the order exhibited in the *first* column.
- Col. II. The order of the second column is that followed in (1) the splendid MS. in the National Library, Paris, dated A. D. 1286, and in (2) Oriental 2091 in the British Museum.
- Col. III. The sequence in the third column is that of the following eleven MSS.: (1) The St Petersburg Codex, dated A. D. 916; (2) the MS. of the whole Bible, dated A. D. 1009 also in St. Petersburg; (3) Oriental 2201 dated A. D. 1246 in the British Museum; (4) Arund. Orient. 16; (5) Harley 1528; (6) Harley 5710-11; (7) Add. 1525; (8) Add. 15251; (9) Add. 15252; (10) Orient. 2348, and (11) Orient. 2626-28. These MSS. exhibit the order in the third column.
- Col. IV. In the fourth column I give the order which is adopted in the five Early Editions, viz. (1) the first edition of the entire Bible, Soncino A. D. 1488; (2) the second edition, Naples A. D. 1491—93; (3) the third edition, Brescia A. D. 1494; (4) the first edition of the Rabbinic Bible edited by Felix Pratensis, Venice A. D. 1517, and (5) the first edition of the Bible with the Massorah, edited by Jacob ben Chayim, Venice A. D. 1524—25. It will be seen that all these editions follow the order in the third column so far as the Latter Prophets are concerned.

Table showing the order of the Latter Prophets.

I	II	111	IV
Talmud and three MSS.	Two MSS. Paris and London	Eleven MSS.	Five Early Editions
Jeremiah	Jeremiah	Isaiah	Isaiah
Ezekiel	Isaiah	Jeremiah	Jeremiah
Isai a h	Ezekiel	Ezekiel	Ezekiel
Minor Prophets	Minor Prophets	Minor Prophets	Minor Prophets

The Hagiographa.

The variations in the order of the Hagiographa are far more numerous, as is disclosed in the following MSS. which I have collated for this division. They exhibit the order given in the various columns:

- Col. I. (1) The Talmud; (2) the splendid Codex No. 1 in the Madrid University Library, dated A. D. 1280;
 (3) Harley 1528, British Museum; (4) Add. 1525;
 - (5) Orient. 2212; (6) Orient. 2375, and (7) Orient. 4227.
- Col. II. The following have the order of the second column: (1) The magnificent MS. in the National Library, Paris Nos. 1—3, dated A. D. 1286, and (2) Orient. 2001 in the British Museum.
- Col. III. The order of the third column is in Add. 15252.
- Col. IV. The sequence in the fourth column is that of
 (1) the St. Petersburg MS., dated A. D. 1009;
 (2) in the Adath Deborim, A. D. 1207; (3) Harley
 5710—11, and (4) Add. 15251.
- Col. V. The order in the *fifth* column is that of the Model Codex, Arund. Orient. 16.
- Col. VI. The order in the sixth column is that of the magnificent MS. Orient. 2626—28.
- Col. VII. Whilst the order given in the seventh column is to be found in Orient. 2201, dated A. D. 1246.
- Col. VIII. The five early editions which I have already described, follow the order exhibited in the eighth column.

Table showing the order of the Hagiographa.

 	J		T	пе от	uer c	or the	В00	KS.					
IIIA	Five Early Editions	Psalms	Proverbs	Job	Song of Songs	Ruth	Lamentations	Ecclesiastes	Esther	Daniel	Ezra-Nehemiah Ezra-Nehemiah	Chronicles	
VII	Or. 2201	Psalms	Job	Proverbs	Ruth	Song of Songs	Ecclesiastes	Lamentations	Esther	Daniel	Ezra-Nehemiah	Chronicles	
IΛ	Or. 2626–28	Chronicles	Psalms	Proverbs	Job	Daniel	Ruth	Song of Songs Lamentations	Lamentations	Ecclesiastes	Esther	Ezra-Nehemiah Ezra-Nehemiah Ezra-Nehemiah Chronicles	
Λ	Ar. Or. 16	Chronicles	Ruth	Psalms	Job	Proverbs		Ecclesiastes	Lamentations	Esther	Daniel	Ezra-Nehemiah	
ΛI	Adath Deborim and three MSS.	Chronicles	Psalms	Job	Proverbs	Ruth	Song of Songs Song of Songs	Ecclesiastes	Lamentations	Esther	Daniel	Ezra-Nehemiah	
Ш	Add. 15252	Ruth	Psalms	Job	Proverbs	Song of Songs	Ecclesiastes	Lamentations	Daniel	Esther	Ezra-Nehemiah Ezra-Nehemiah Ezra-Nehemiah Daniel	Chronicles	
п	Two MSS. Paris and London	Ruth	Psalms	Job	Proverbs	Song of Songs	Ecclesiastes	Lamentations	Esther	Daniel	Ezra-Nehemiah	Chronicles	
I	Talmud and six MSS.	Ruth	Psalms	Job	Proverbs	Ecclesiastes	Song of Songs	Lamentations	Daniel	Esther	Ezra-Nehemiah	Chronicles	
		I	8	ю	4	75	9	7	x 0	6	IO	11	

It is to be remarked that in the *eighth* column which exhibits the order of the early editions, the five Megilloth are not given again, in the first three editions, under the Hagiographa, since, in these editions they follow immediately after the Pentateuch, as explained above, on page 3 &c.

The order which I have adopted in my edition of the Hebrew Bible, is that of the early editions.

Chap. II.

The sectional divisions of the text.

In describing the manner in which the Hebrew text is divided in the MSS. and which I have followed in this edition, it is necessary to separate the Pentateuch from the Prophets and the Hagiographa. The Pentateuch is divided in four different ways: — (1) Open and Closed Sections, (2) Triennial Pericopes, (3) Annual Pericopes, and (4) into verses.

Open and Closed Sections.

I. According to the Massoretic order (1) an Open Section (פתוחה) has two forms. (a) It begins with the full line and is indicated by the previous line being unfinished. The vacant space of the unfinished line must be that of three triliteral words. (b) If, however, the text of the previous Section fills up the last line, the next line must be left entirely blank, and the Open Section must begin a linea with the following line. (2) The Closed Section (סתומה) has also two forms. (a) It is indicated by its beginning with an indented line, the previous line being either finished or unfinished: this minor break, therefore, resembles what we should call a new paragraph. And (b) if the previous Section ends in the middle of the line, the prescribed vacant space must be left after it, and the first word or words of the Closed Section must be written at the end of the same line, so that the break is exhibited in the middle of the line. In the Synagogue Scrolls, which have preserved the most ancient practice, as well as in the best and oldest MSS. in book form, this is the only way in which the Open and Closed Sections are indicated. The practice of putting a D [= IDID] or D [= IDID] in the vacant space, to indicate an Open or Closed Section, adopted in some MSS. and editions, is of later date. I have, therefore, disregarded it and followed the earlier MSS. and editions. With some slight exceptions the MSS. on the whole exhibit uniformity in the indication of these divisions in the Pentateuch. Moreover, separate Lists have been preserved, giving the catchwords of each Open and Closed Section throughout the Pentateuch.

But no such care has been exercised by the Massorites in indicating the Open and Closed Sections in the Prophets and Hagiographa, and no separate List of them has as yet been discovered. Hence, though the sectional divisions are tolerably uniform, it is frequently impossible to say whether the break indicates an Open or Closed Section. Moreover, some MSS. very frequently exhibit an Open Section, whilst other MSS. describe the same Section as a Closed one, and vice versa. The insertion, therefore, of בתוחה [פתוחה into the text of the Prophets and Hagiographa, as has been done by Dr. Baer, can at best rest on only one MS., which may represent one Massoretic School, and is contradicted by the majority of standard Codices, which proceed from more generally recognised Schools of Massorites. This will be seen from the description of these Sections in the MSS., and the manner in which Dr. Baer has treated them in the edition of his so-called Massoretic text.

For the Sections in the Former Prophets, viz. Joshua, Judges, Samuel and Kings, I have minutely collated the following six standard Codices in the British Museum.

(1) Oriental 2201; (2) Oriental 2626—2628; (3) Arundel

Oriental 16; (4) Harley 1528; (5) Harley 5710—11; and (6) Add. 15250. The catchwords of the respective Sections in these MSS. and in Dr. Baer's edition I have arranged in seven parallel columns, and the result shows what Dr. Baer has omitted.

In Joshua Dr. Baer omitted twenty-nine Sections which are plainly given in the MSS. They are as follows: (1) Josh. I 12 is not only given in all the six MSS., but has 'ב [= פרוחה in the vacant space in Arundel Or. 16; (2) III 5 is given in all the six MSS.; (3) VI 12 is in all the six MSS.; (4) VII 10 is in four MSS.; (5) IX 3 is in all the six MSS.; (6) X 34 is in three MSS. and marked יחס in Arund. Or. 16; (7) X 36 is in five MSS. and marked in Arund. Or. 16; (8) XI to is in five MSS. and marked in Arund. Or. 16; (9) XII 9 is in all the six MSS. and is marked 'חם in Arund. Or. 16; (10) XIII 33 is in four MSS.; (11) XV 37 is in five MSS.; (12) XV 43 is in four MSS.; (13) XV 52 is in five MSS.; (14) XV 55 is in five MSS.; (15) XV 58 is in five MSS.; (16) XV 60 is in four MSS.; (17) XV 61 is in five MSS.; (18) XX 5 is in four MSS.; (19) XXI 6 is in five MSS.; (20) XXI 7 is in five MSS.; (21) XXI 8 is in three MSS.; (22) XXI 13 is in four MSS.; (23) XXI 23 is in five MSS.; (24) XXI 25 is in four MSS.; (25) XXI 28 is in four MSS.; (26) XXI 30 is in four MSS.; (27) XXI 32 is in five MSS.; (28) XXI 38 is in five MSS.; (29) XXII 7 is not only in five MSS. but is marked מתי in Arund. Or. 16.

Besides these serious omissions Dr. Baer has one break, viz. Josh. XXIV 21, marked in his text D which is against the authority of five out of the six MSS. His designation of some of the Sections is also against the MSS. Thus Dr. Baer has put D in the break of Josh. XI 6, whereas Arund. Or. 16 which is a model Codex, has 'DD. The same is the case in XV 1, where Dr. Baer has in-

serted D into the text, and Arund. Or. 16 has The reverse is the case in Josh. XXII 1. Here Dr. Baer has inserted D, whereas Arund. Or. 16 marks it 'DD.

In Judges Dr. Baer has omitted eighteen Sections.

(1) I 27 which is in four MSS.; (2) I 29 is in four MSS.;

(3) I 30 is in all the six MSS.; (4) I 31 is in all the six MSS.; (5) I 33 is in all the six MSS.; (6) III 7 is in all the six MSS.; (7) VI 20 is in four MSS.; (8) VII 1 is not only in four MSS., but has for MSS.; (8) VII 1 is not only in four MSS., but has for in all the six MSS. and is marked for in Arund. Or. 16; (10) VIII 10 is in all the six MSS.; (11) VIII 33 is in all the six MSS.; (12) IX 1 is in all the six MSS.; (13) IX 6 is in all the six MSS.; (14) IX 42 is in all the six MSS.; (15) XI 32 is in four MSS. and is marked for marked for MSS.; (15) XI 32 is in four MSS. and is marked for MSS.; (16) XX 3 is in four MSS.; (17) XX 30 is in five MSS. and (18) XXI 5 is in five MSS.

Dr. Baer again has two Sections in his text, viz. Judg. III 15; which he marks D, and XX 15 which he marks D in the text, but which are not found in any of the six MSS., whilst XXI 19 is supported by only one of the six MSS. Moreover Dr. Baer has D in the vacant space of the following four Sections: Judg. XI 29; XII 1; XX 12 and XXI 1. In all of them Arund. Or. 16 has 7DD.

In Samuel Dr. Baer has omitted fifty-one Sections: (1) VIII 11 which is not only in four MSS., but is marked in the vacant space 'DD in Arund. Or. 16; (2) XII 18 is in five MSS.; (3) XIII 13 is in all the six MSS.; (4) XIV 6 is in five MSS.; (5) XIV 8 is in four MSS.; (6) XV 17 is in four MSS.; (7) XV 22 is in five MSS.; (8) XIX 4 is in four MSS.; (9) XX 1 is in five MSS.; (10) XX 35 is in four MSS.; (11) XXXX 7 is in all the six MSS.; (12) XXXX 27 is in five MSS.; (13) 2 Sam. XI 2 is in all the six MSS.; (14) XI 16 is in five MSS.; (15) XI 25 is in four MSS.;

(16) XII 7 is in three MSS.; (17) XIII 28 is in five MSS.; (18) XIII 32 is in all the six MSS.; (19) XIII 34 is in all the six MSS.; (20) XIV 10 is in all the six MSS.; (21) XIV 21 is in all the six MSS.; (22) XIV 24 is in all the six MSS.; (23) XIV 28 is in all the six MSS.; (24) XV 19 is in five MSS.; (25) XV 25 is in all the six MSS.; (26) XVI 1 is in all the six MSS.; (27) XVI 10 is in four MSS.; (28) XVIII 4 is in four MSS.; (29) XVIII 18 is in four MSS.; (30) XIX 22 is in five MSS.; (31) XIX 23 is in five MSS.; (32) XIX 39 is in five MSS.; (33) XIX 41 is in five MSS.; (34) XX 6 is in five MSS.; (35) XX 23 is in five MSS.; (36) XXIII 1 is not only in all the six MSS., but is marked יום in the vacant space in Arund. Or. 16; (37) XXIII 25; (38) XXIII 26; (39) XXIII 27; (40) XXIII 28; (41) XXIII 29; (42) XXIII 30; (43) XXIII 31; (44) XXIII 32; (45) XXIII 33; (46) XXIII 34; (47) XXIII 35; (48) XXIII 36; (49) XXIII 37; (50) XXIII 38 and (51) XXIII 29 are all in all the six MSS.

Dr. Baer marks four Sections in the text which are supported by only one MS., viz. 2 Sam. XIII 21; XVI 3; XVII 22 and XXIV 16. He moreover marks three Sections, viz. 1 Sam. V 11; 2 Sam. IX 4 and X 15 which are not in any of the six MSS. The following fourteen Sections: 1 Sam. II 27; VI 25; VIII 7; XIII 1, 15; XIV 7; XXIX 11; 2 Sam. I 17; III 14; IV 4, 11, 22; VII 1 and XVI 15 are given by Dr. Baer as D, whereas in Arund. Or. 16 they are all marked 'DD.

As Dr. Baer's Kings has not yet appeared, I must pass on to the analysis of the Latter Prophets, viz. Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and the Minor Prophets. In the examination of the sectional divisions of this portion of the Hebrew Bible I have had the invaluable help of the St. Petersburg Codex, dated A. D. 916, which has been edited in beautiful fac-simile by Professor Strack. This MS. strictly

observes the rules with regard to the form of the Open and Closed Sections already described (Comp. pp. 9, 10). So strict was the Scribe in exhibiting the nature of the Sections that in one instance, when an Open Section ends with a full line at the bottom of the column, which according to the rule necessitated an entire blank line, he put a D[= INTITAL] in the middle of the vacant space, to show that there is nothing wanting, but that the blank line indicates an Open Section. 1

This Codex moreover shows that in early times the Open and Closed Sections were as carefully indicated in the Prophets and Hagiographa as in the Pentateuch, and that the neglect to attend to the prescribed rules with regard to the vacant spaces for these two kinds of Sections is due to later Scribes.

In the case of the Prophets Isaiah and Jeremiah I have also carefully collated the beautiful Lisbon edition A. D. 1492, the editors of which were the first to introduce into the text of the Prophets the letters 5 and 5 to indicate the Open and Closed Sections.

In Isaiah Dr. Baer has omitted twenty-four Sections. They are as follows: (1) I 18 which is in six MSS. and in the Lisbon edition; (2) II 12 which is in all the seven MSS. and in the Lisbon edition; (3) III 1 is in all the seven MSS. and in the Lisbon edition; (4) III 13 is in all the seven MSS. and in the Lisbon edition and is marked 'DD in the text in Arund. Or. 16; (5) III 18 is in all the seven MSS. and in the Lisbon edition; (6) V 24 is in five MSS. and in the Lisbon edition; (7) VIII 3 is in four MSS.; (8) IX 7 is in six MSS. and in the Lisbon edition; (9) XVII 9 is in six MSS. and in the Lisbon edition and is marked 'DD in Arund. Or. 16; (10) XVIII 7 is in three MSS. and in the Lisbon

¹ Comp. St. Petersburg Codex, Jerem. L 46, fol. 115b.

edition and is marked 'סת in Arund. Or. 16; (11) XIX 23 is in five MSS. and in the Lisbon edition; (12) XXXIII 1 is in all the seven MSS, and in the Lisbon edition; (13) XXXVII 1 is in four MSS. and in the Lisbon edition; (14) XL 6 is in five MSS. and in the Lisbon edition; (15) XL 17 is in four MSS. and in the Lisbon edition; (16) XLII 1 is in all the seven MSS. as well as in the Lisbon edition and is marked 'DD in Arund. Or. 16; (17) XLIII 23 is in five MSS. and in the Lisbon edition; (18) XLIII 25 is in two MSS, as well as in the Lisbon edition and is marked in Arund. Or. 16; (19) XLIV 1 is in all the seven MSS. and in the Lisbon edition; (20) XLVII 1 is in four MSS.; (21) XLIX 24 is in five MSS.; (22) LII 11 is in six MSS. and in the Lisbon edition; (23) LVII 3 is in all the seven MSS. and is marked in the Lisbon edition 555 and (24) LXVII 12 which is in all the seven MSS. and in the Lisbon edition.

Dr. Baer has two breaks, marked in the text by D, viz. Is. VII 20 and XXXVI 11, which are supported by only one MS. out of the seven. He moreover represents in the text three sections by D, viz. XXVIII 6; XLIV 1 and LVIII 1, which are described as DD in Arund. Or. 16.

In Jeremiah Dr. Baer has omitted the following twenty Sections: (1) VII 3 which is not only in six MSS. and in the Lisbon edition, but is marked in the text 'nd in Arund. Or. 16; (2) VII 12 which is in six MSS., (3) VII 16 which is in four MSS. as well as in the Lisbon edition and is marked name in Arund. Or. 16; (4) VIII 4 is in five MSS. as well as in the Lisbon edition and is marked 'nd in Arund. Or. 16; (5) VIII 17 is in four MSS.; (6) VIII 23 is in six MSS.; (7) X 6 is in six MSS. and in the Lisbon edition; (8) XI 20 is in five MSS. and in the Lisbon edition; (9) XIII 18 is in six MSS. and in the Lisbon edition; (10) XIII 20 is in four MSS. and in the Lisbon edition; (11) XV 17 is in four

MSS.; (12) XVII 11 is in five MSS. and in the Lisbon edition; (13) XVII 21 is in four MSS. and in the Lisbon edition; (14) XXIX 20 is in two MSS. and is marked 'nd in Arund. Or. 16.; (15) XXIX 21 is in five MSS. and in the Lisbon edition; (16) XXX 10 is in five MSS.; (17) XXXII 16 is in five MSS. and is marked 'nd in Arund. Or. 16; (18) XXXIII 25 is in six MSS. and in the Lisbon edition; (19) XLVI 20 is in five MSS. and in the Lisbon edition and (20) L 18 which is in four MSS. and in the Lisbon edition.

CHAP. II.

Dr. Baer has one Section in the text marked D, viz. Jerem. IX 1 which is not in any of the seven MSS. and one Section XXXVII 17 marked in the text D which is supported by only one MS. out the seven.

He has moreover inserted into the text D against the following twenty-four Sections: I 3; IX 16; X 1; XI 6; XI 14; XIV 11; XVI 16; XVII 19; XVIII 5; XIX 1; XIX 14; XXI 1; XXI 11; XXII 10; XXIII 1, 5, 15; XXIV 1; XXV 8; XXXI 23; XXXII 42; XXXIV 1; XXXVII 9, and XL 7, — all of which are marked 'DD in the text in Arund. Or. 16. Again, two Sections, viz. XIII 8 and XXII 11, he marks D in the text, whereas they are marked 'DD in Arund. Or. 16.

In Ezekiel Dr. Baer has omitted the following twenty-one Sections: (1) V 10 which is in four MSS.; (2) VIII 12 is in four MSS.; (3) X 1 is in three MSS.; (4) XI 2 is in six MSS.; (5) XI 4 is in six MSS.; (6) XIII 13 is in six MSS.; (7) XIII 20 is in five MSS. (8) XIV 6 in six MSS. (9) XIV 9 which is not only in all the seven MSS., but is marked 'DD in the text in Arund. Or. 16; (10) XVI 51 which is in four MSS. and is marked in the text 'DD in Arund. Or. 16; (11) XVIII 27 is in five MSS.; (12) XXI 31 is in five MSS.; (13) XXII 19 is in six MSS.; (14) XXIII 11 is in five MSS.; (15) XXIII 22 is in all the seven MSS.; (16) XXIX 21 is in four MSS.; (17) XXXIII 25 is in four MSS.; (18) XXXIV 10 is in

five MSS.; (19) XXXVIII 17 is in all the seven MSS.; (20) XLVI 6 is in six MSS. and (21) XLVI 12 which is in all the seven MSS

Dr. Baer has a break in the text with D in IX 7 which is against all the seven MSS., whilst in VIII 15 he has a break with a D which is supported by only one MS. He moreover has put D into the text against the following six Sections: XXI 1, 13; XXII 1; XXIV 15; XXVIII 20 and XXXIII 23, all of which are marked 'DD in Arund. Or. 16

In the Minor Prophets Dr. Baer has omitted the following twelve Sections: (1) Joel I 13 which is in five MSS.; (2) Amos VII 12 is in six MSS.; (3) VIII 9 which is in all the seven MSS.; (4) Micah III I is in five MSS.; (5) Zeph. III 16 is in three MSS; (6) Hag. I 3 is in all the seven MSS.; (7) I 12 which is in all the seven MSS.; (8) I ו סתר in four MSS. and marked סתר in Arund. Or. 16; (9) Zech. V 9 is in five MSS.; (10) VI 1 is in five MSS.; (11) XIV 6 is in five MSS. and (12) XIV 12 which is not only in all the seven MSS, but is marked יחם in Arund. Or. 16. Dr. Baer has one Section marked D which is not in any of the seven MSS., whilst two of his Sections, viz. Amos V 3 and Jonah II 2, are supported by one MS only. He moreover marks the following five Sections in the text with D which are described as 'DD in Arund. Or. 16; Hos. XIII 12; Zech. VIII 6, 7; IX 9 and XI 4.

The *Psalms* have no Sections, as each Psalm constitutes a continuous and undivided whole. But special notice is to be taken of the fact that according to the Massorah the Psalter, Proverbs and Job are the three poetical books of the Hebrew Scriptures. Accordingly they have not only distinctive poetical accents, but in the best MSS. the lines are poetically divided and arranged in hemistichs. There is no other division between the separate Psalms

than the heading which occupies the middle of the line, and there is no vacant space whatever between the end of one Psalm and the beginning of the other. The number of each Psalm is given in the margin. This is the arrangement in three of the six Model Codices which I have collated for the sectional divisions, viz. Or. 2201 dated A. D. 1246, Harley 5710—11, and Or. 2626—28, as well as in Add. 15251 and in many other MSS.

In the first edition of the entire Hebrew Bible, Soncino A. D. 1488, the editors, who were more bent upon saving space than to exhibit the hemistichal division of the MSS., discarded the poetical arrangement of the lines. But in the second edition of the entire Bible printed at Naples circa A. D. 1491—93 the lines are duly arranged in hemistichs. Instead of following this carefully printed edition which reproduces the best MSS., later editors, for the same economical reasons, followed the example of the Soncino edition. Dr. Baer has adopted the same plan, whereas I have followed the standard Codices, though I have not always adopted their exact division of the lines especially as the MSS. themselves vary in this respect.

For the sectional division of *Proverbs* I have also collated the splendid MS. in the National Library of Paris, marked in the Catalogue Nos. 1—3, which is dated A. D. 1286. This MS. divides the book of Proverbs into thirty-nine Sections. Thirty-two of these Sections are not only preceded by a vacant line, but have against them in the margin the letter **D** which describes them as Open Sections, whilst the other seven are simply preceded by a vacant

¹ It is, however, to be remarked that in some MSS, the Psalter has only 147 Psalms since IX and X are one, LXX and LXXI are one, CIV and CV are one, CXVII and CXVIII 4 are one, whilst CXVIII 5 begins a new Psalm. This is the case in MS. No. 4 in the Imperial and Royal Court Library at Vienna.

line without the letter D, or have a vacant space in the middle of the line, which marks them as Closed Sections. The following thirty-two Sections have the D against them in the margin: (1) I 8; (2) I 20; (3) II 1; (4) III 1; (5) III 5; (6) IV 20; (7) VI 1; (8) VI 6; (9) VI 12; (10) VII 1; (11) VIII 32; (12) IX 1; (13) XIX 10; (14) XXII 28; (15) XXIV +9; (16) XXIV 23; (17) XXIV 28; (18) XXIV 30; (19) XXV 2; (20) XXV 14; (21) XXV 21; (22) XXVI 9; (23) XXVI 22; (24) XXVII 23; (25) XXVIII 11; (26) XXVIII 17; (27) XXIX 18; (28) XXX 7; (29) XXX 10; (30) XXX 18; (31) XXX 21; (32) XXXI 10. The following four Sections are preceded by a vacant line without D: (1) VI 20; (2) XVIII 10; (3) XIX 1 and (4) XXXI 1. Whilst of the three remaining Sections two have a vacant space in the middle of the line, viz. VII 24 and XXV 1, and one, viz. X I, has the single word משלי in the middle of the line. I have not inserted three of these thirty-nine Sections, though marked with 2 against them in the margin, viz. XXV 2; XXVI 9; XXVIII 11, because they are not supported by any of the other six MSS., whilst I have adopted the following thirteen Sections which are in the other MSS. though they are not to be found in this Codex, viz. (1) III 11; (2) III 19; (3) IV 1; (4) V 1; (5) V 7; (6) VI 16; (7) VIII 22; (8) XIII 1; (9) XV 20; (10) XXII 22; (11) XXX 15; (12) XXX 24 and (13) XXX 29.

Dr. Baer has omitted the following twelve Sections: (1) III 5 which is in two MSS. and is marked 5 in P.; 1 (2) VII 24 which is in six MSS.; (3) XIX 10 is in four MSS. and marked 5 in P.; (4) XXII 28 is in two MSS. and marked 5 in P.; (5) XXIV 19 is in two MSS. and marked 5 in P.; (6) XXIV 28 is in two MSS. and marked 5 in P.; (7) XXV 14

¹ In this paragraph the letter "P." stands for the Paris Codex, referred to above.

is in six MSS. and marked 5 in P.; (8) XXV 21 is in three MSS. and marked 5 in P.; (9) XXVI 22 is in six MSS. and marked 5 in P.; (10) XXVII 23 is in six MSS. and marked 5 in P.; (11) XXVIII 17 which is not only in all the seven MSS., but is marked 5 in P. and (12) XXXI 10 which is also in all the seven MSS. and marked 5 in P.

Dr. Baer has the following nineteen Sections, and has inserts D into the text, contrary to all the seven MSS.:

(1) III 27; (2) V 18; (3) VIII 6; (4) IX 12; (5) X 6; (6) X 11; (7) XIII 15; (8) XIV 4; (9) XIV 16; (10) XIV 24; (11) XV 1; (12) XVI 3; (13) XVII 24; (14) XXII 1; (15) XXV 13; (16) XXV 25; (17) XXVII 21; (18) XXVIII 6 and (19) XXVIII 16.

Dr. Baer moreover has three Sections marked D in the text, which are respectively supported by only one MS., viz. IV 10; VIII 1 and XII 4.

In Job Dr. Baer has a break and inserts \overline{c} in the text, viz. XXXIX 14, contrary to all the seven MSS.

In Canticles Dr. Baer has omitted two Sections, viz. II 14 which is in all the six MSS., and IV 12 which is in four MSS.

In Ruth III 8 Dr. Baer has a break and inserts D into the text against all the six MSS.

In the four alphabetical chapters in Lamentations all the standard Codices have breaks between the verses which begin with the respective letters as exhibited in my edition. In Dr. Baer's edition the verses in question are printed without any break.

In Ecclesiastes Dr. Baer has omitted the Section in III 2 which is to be found in all the six MSS. He has a break and has inserted 5 into the text in III 1, which is contrary to all the six MSS. He has the following three Sections marked in the text by 5, viz. III 14; V 1; and XII 9, against all the six MSS. He has two Sections, viz. IV 1

CHAP. II.

and IX 11, marked D in the text which are supported by only one MS.

In Daniel Dr. Baer has omitted three Sections: (1) II 37 which is in four MSS.; (2) V 8 which is in four MSS. and (3) VI 7 which is also in four MSS. He has inserted four Sections and marked them in the text D, viz. (1) II 36; (2) III 30; (3) VI 11 and (4) X 9 contrary to all the six MSS.

In Ezra Dr. Baer has omitted the following eleven Sections: (1) III I which is in four MSS.; (2) IV 12 which is in five MSS.; (3) V I which is in all the six MSS.; (4) V 3 is in five MSS.; (5) V 13 is in all the six MSS.; (6) VI 16 is in all six MSS.; (7) VII 7 is in five MSS.; (8) VII 12 is in four MSS.; (9) VII 25 is in four MSS.; (10) VIII 20 is in five MSS. and (11) X I which is in all the six MSS. He has two Sections marked D in the text, viz. I 9; and V 4, which are in only one MS.

In Nehemiah Dr. Baer has omitted eight Sections, viz. (1) II 4 which is in four MSS.; (2) VI 14 is in five MSS.; (3) X 1 which is in all six MSS.; (4) X 35 is in five MSS.; (5) XI 19 is in four MSS.; (6) XI 22 is in four MSS.; (7) XI 24 is in four MSS. and (8) XIII 23 which is in five MSS.

In 1 Chronicles Dr. Baer has omitted seventy-two Sections as follows: (1) I 18 is in four MSS.; (2) I 29 is in four MSS.; (3) I 32 is in all the six MSS.; (4) I 33 is in five MSS.; (5) I 35 which is not only in four MSS., but is marked and in Arund. Or. 16; (6) I 38 which is in all six MSS.; (7) I 39 is in five MSS.; (8) I 40 is in four MSS.; (9) II 5 is in five MSS.; (10) II 7 is in all six MSS.; (11) II 8 is in four MSS.; (12) II 9 is in four MSS.; (13) IV 19 is in five MSS.; (14) V 11 is in all six MSS.; (15) V 29 is in four MSS.; (16) VI 24 is in five MSS.; (17) IX 12 which is in four MSS. and is marked and in Arund. Or. 16; (18) X 11 is in four MSS.; (19) XI 11 is in five MSS. and is marked and in Arund. Or. 16; (20) XI 22 is

CHAP. II.

in four MSS.; (21) XII 17 is in five MSS.; (22) XII 19 is not only in all the six MSS., but is marked 'DD in Arund. Or. 16; (23) XXI 27 is in four MSS.; (24) XXIV 19 is in four MSS.; (25) XXV 3 is marked 'DD in Arund. Or. 16; (26) XXV 4 is in five MSS, and is marked 'ND in Arund. Or. 16; (27) XXV 10 is in five MSS. and is marked 'ND in Arund. Or. 16; (28) XXV II is in five MSS. and is marked 'no in Arund. Or. 16; (29) XXV 12 is in five MSS. and is marked 'On in Arund. Or. 16; (30) XXV 13 is in five MSS. and is marked 'DD in Arund. Or. 16; (31) XXV 14 is in five MSS, and is marked 'no in Arund. Or. 16; (32) XXV 15 is in five MSS. and is marked 'חס in Arund. Or. 16; (33) XXV 16 is in five MSS. and is marked in Arund. Or. 16; (34) XXV 17 is in five MSS and is marked 'חם in Arund. Or. 16; (35) XXV 18 is in five MSS. and is marked 'DD in Arund. Or. 16; (36) XXV 19 is in five MSS. and is marked 'On in Arund. Or. 16; (37) XXV 20 is in five MSS, and is marked 'DD in Arund. Or. 16; (38) XXV 21 is in five MSS. and is marked 'no in Arund. Or. 16; (30) XXV 22 is in five MSS. and is marked 'ND in Arund. Or. 16; (40) XXV 23 is in five MSS. and is marked 'DD in Arund. Or. 16; (41) XXV 24 is in five MSS. and is marked 'סת' in Arund. Or. 16; (42) XXV 25 is in five MSS. and is marked 'DD in Arund. Or. 16; (43) XXV 26 is in five MSS, and is marked 'DD in Arund Or. 16; (44) XXV 27 is in five MSS. and is marked יחס in Arund. Or. 16; (45) XXV 28 is in five MSS. and is marked יחם in Arund. Or. 16; (46) XXV 29 is in five MSS. and is marked יחם in Arund. Or. 16; (47) XXV 30 is in five MSS. and is marked יחם in Arund. Or. 16; (48) XXV 31 is in five MSS. and is marked 'סת in Arund. Or. 16; (49) XXVI 6 is in three MSS. and is marked 'סת in Arund. Or. 16; (50) XXVI 7 is in three MSS. and is marked 'no in Arund. Or. 16; (51) XXVI 10 is in four MSS.; (52) XXVI 29 which is in all the six MSS.; (53) XXVII 2 is in five MSS.; (54) XXVII 4 is in four MSS.; (55) XXVII 7 is in four MSS.; (56) XXVII 8 is in four MSS.; (57) XXVII 9 is in four MSS.; (58) XXVII 10 is in four MSS.; (59) XXVII 11 is in four MSS.; (60) XXVII 12 is in four MSS.; (61) XXVII 13 is in four MSS.; (62) XXVII 14 is in four MSS.; (63) XXVII 15 is in four MSS.; (64) XXVII 17 is in four MSS.; (65) XXVII 18 is in four MSS.; (66) XXVII 19 is in four MSS.; (67) XXVII 20 is in four MSS.; (68) XXVII 21 is in four MSS.; (69) XXVII 22 is in four MSS.; (70) XXVII 26 is in four MSS.; (71) XXVII 27 is in four MSS.; and (72) XXVII 32 which is in four MSS.

Dr. Baer moreover has one Section and inserted D into the text, viz. XXIII 12, which is against all the six MSS. He has four Sections marked with D in the text, viz. I 8; VI 14; XXI 28 and XXVI 19, which are supported by only one of the six MSS. The following three Sections he describes as D: I Chron III 1; IV 24; IX 35, which are marked ID in Arund. Or. 16; and four Sections which he marks D, viz. XV 3; 11; XIX 1; and XXIX 26, are marked ID in Arund. Or. 16.

In 2 Chronicles Dr. Baer has omitted the following thirty-five Sections: (1) III 17 which is in three MSS.; (2) IV 19 is in five MSS; (3) VII 5 is not only in four MSS., but is marked in in Arund. Or. 16; (4) XVI 6 is in four MSS.; (5) XVII 14 is in five MSS.; (6) XVII 15 is in all the six MSS.; (7) XVII 16 is in all the six MSS.; (8) XVII 17 is in all the six MSS.; (9) XVII 18 is in all the six MSS.; (10) XVII 19 is in four MSS.; (11) XXI 4 is in all the six MSS.; (12) XXVIII 6 is in five MSS.; (13) XXVIII 7 is in four MSS.; (14) XXVIII 8 is in all the six MSS.; (15) XXVIII 12 is in all the six MSS.; (16) XXVIII 14 is in all the six MSS.; (17) XXIX 14 is in four MSS.; (18) XXIX 27 is in five MSS.; (19) XXXX 10 is in all the six MSS.; (20) XXX 20 is in all the six MSS.;

(21) XXX 22 is in all the six MSS.; (22) XXX 27 is in four MSS.; (23) XXXI 1 is in five MSS.; (24) XXXI 2 is in all the six MSS.; (25) XXXI 3 is in five MSS.; (26) XXXI 7 is in five MSS.; (27) XXXI 8 is in four MSS.; (28) XXXII 21 is in five MSS.; (29) XXXIV 12 is in five MSS.; (30) XXXIV 22 is in four MSS.; (31) XXXIV 24 is in all the six MSS.; (32) XXXIV 29 is not only in all the six MSS., but is marked 'ND in Arund. Or. 16.; (33) XXXV 7 is in five MSS.; (34) XXXV 8 is in five MSS. and (35) XXXV 19 is in four MSS.

Dr. Baer moreover has a break in the text and inserts D in four places, viz. 2 Chron. V 3; XIX 5; XXI 5 and XXV 13, contrary to all the six MSS. The following three Sections which he marks with D: IV 10, 11; and VII 11, are supported by only one of the six MSS. He marks one Section D (XVIII 28) which is marked 'DD in Arund. Or. 16.

It will be seen from the above analysis that these omissions, additions and misdescriptions in Dr. Baer's text of the Open and Closed Sections, extend to almost every page. As they exhibit a serious difference between his text and mine, I have been obliged minutely to describe the MS. authorities which caused this difference.

Chap. III.

The Division into Chapters.

The division of the text into chapters is not of Jewish Origin. From a note appended to MS. No. 13 in the Cambridge University Library it will be seen that R. Salomon b. Ismael circa A. D. 1330 adopted the Christian numeration of chapters, and placed the numerals in the margin of the Hebrew Bible, for controversial purposes, in order to facilitate reference to particular passages. For the same purpose probably, later Scribes or private owners of MSS. added these chapters in the margin of early Codices. And though in the great majority of instances the Christian chapters coincide with one or the other of the Massoretic Sections, they nevertheless contradict in many instances the divisions of the Massorah. This contradiction is not so glaring in the practice adopted by R. Salomon, since he simply places the number of the

י אלו הן פרקי הנוים הנקראים קפיטולש של ארבעה ועשרים ספרים ושמות כל ספר וספר בלשונם והעתקתים מהספר שלהם שיוכל אדם להשיב להם תשובה מהרה על שאלותם שהם שואלים לנו בכל יום על ענין אמונתנו ותורתנו הקרושה ומביאים ראיות מפסוקי התורה הן מנביאים או מספרים אחרים ואומרים לנו ראה וקרא בפסוק פלוני שהוא בספר פלוני בכך וכך קפיטולש מהספר ואין אנו יורעים מה הוא הקפיטולש ולהשיב להם מהרה תשובה לכן העתקתים פס ספר בראשית נקרא בל הוא הקפיטולש ולהשיב להם מהרה תשובה לכן העתקתים פס ספר בראשית וני": At the end of the List (fol. 246a) the following statement is made: "נשלמו פרקי הגוים מכל כ"ר שלמה בן איסמעאל מן הספרים שלהם כדי שיוכל אדם להשיב ספרים והעתים אותם ר' שלמה בן איסמעאל מן הספרים שלהם כדי שיוכל אדם להשיב Comp. fol. 245a, also Catalogue of the Hebrew Manuscripts in the University Library Cambridge by Schiller-Szinessy, pp. 17, 18, Cambridge 1876.

chapter in Hebrew letters in the margin, whether there is a Massoretic Section or not, without introducing any new break into the text to indicate the chapter in question. The early editors of the printed text, however, up to 1517 adhered closely to the MSS., and had simply the Massoretic divisions into Sections without any marginal indication of the Christian chapters. The Christian editors of the Complutensian Polyglot (1514-17) were the first who discarded the Massoretic sections and adopted the Christian chapters to harmonise the Hebrew text with the Greek and Latin versions in the parallel columns. Though introducing new breaks, they give the numbers of the chapters in Roman numerals but still in the margin. Felix Pratensis, as far as I can trace it, is the first who indicates in the margin the Christian chapters in Hebrew letters throughout the whole of his edition of the Rabbinic Bible published by Bomberg, Venice 1517. But he retained in the text the Massoretic Sections. This practice was not only followed in the three quarto editions containing the Hebrew text alone, which issued from the Bomberg press in 1517, 1521 and 1525, but was adopted by Jacob b. Chayim in his famous edition of the Rabbinic Bible in four volumns folio, also published by Bomberg, Venice 1524-25. It continued in all the Hebrew Bibles not accompanied by translations up to 1570.

As far as I can trace it, Arias Montanus was the first who broke up the Hebrew text into chapters and introduced the Hebrew numerals into the body of the text itself, in his splendid edition of the Hebrew Bible with an interlinear Latin translation, printed by Plantin in one volumn folio at Antwerp 1571.

It was from this edition, as well as from the Polyglots, that this pernicious practice was adopted in the editions of the Hebrew text published by itself. It makes

its first appearance in the Hebrew Bible without vowel-points also published by Plantin in 1573—74. Even Jewish editors, who professed to edit the Hebrew text according to the Massorah, introduced into the text itself these anti-Massoretic breaks. In his beautiful edition of the Hebrew Bible without points the distinguished Menasseh ben Israel broke up the text and inserted the Christian chapters into the vacant space.

Athias, in his celebrated edition 1659-61, not only followed the same example, but went so far as to incorporate the numeration of the chapters in the Massoretic Summary at the end of each book of the Pentateuch, and to coin a mnemonic sign for it. As far as I am able to trace it, he was the first who inserted the enumeration of the chapters with the Massoretic computation. Thus, at the end of Genesis, after giving the Massoretic number of verses, the middle verse, the number of Annual Pericopes and of the Triennial cycle, he states that this book has fifty chapters, and that the mnemonic sign is י"י דונו לך קוינו [O Lord be gracious unto us; we have waited for thee Isa, XXXIII 2]; and then continues the Massoretic Summary. The same he does at the end of Exodus, where he states that it has forty chapters and that the sign is חורת אלהיו בלבו [= the law of his God is in his heart Ps. XXXVII 31]; at the end of Leviticus, which he tells us has twenty-seven chapters and for which the sign is וארוה עמך ואברכך [= and I will be with thee and will bless thee Gen. XXVI 3]; at the end of Numbers, which he tells us has thirty-six chapters and for which the sign is לו חכמו ישכילו ואת [O that they were wise, that they understood this Deut. XXXII 29]; and at the end of Deuteronomy, where he states that it has thirty-four chapters and that the sign is אורה י"י בכל לבב [I will praise the Lord with my whole heart Ps. CXI 1]. All this is pure invention palmed off as a part of the Massorah.

That Jablonski (ed. 1699), Van der Hooght (ed. 1705), Opitius (ed. 1706), Maius (ed. 1716) &c. should have copied Athias, both in his enumeration of the chapters and in his invented mnemonic signs, is not surprising, since they did not know which part of the Summary was Massoretic and which was not. But that Raphael Chayim, the editor of Norzi's excellent Massoretic text with the Minchath Shaï (מנחת שיי Mantua 1732 - 44), should have been taken in by it, is an injury to the memory of the distinguished Massoretic critic whose work he undertook to edit.1 Raphael Chayim did not simply copy Athias and his followers, as far as the Pentateuch is concerned, but went in for uniformity. Hence he incorporated in the Massoretic Summaries the numbers of the chapters at the end of every book throughout the Prophets and the Hagiographa, and invented for them mnemonic signs. It is remarkable that Heidenheim, who in his excellent edition of the Pentateuch with the En-Hakore (עין הקורא) published at Rödelheim 1818-21, denounces this practice of incorporating the numeration of the chapters into the Massoretic Summary, as mixing up the secular [= non-Massoretic] with the sacred [= Massoretic],2 has yet at the end of each book adopted this very mixture, exactly as it appears in Athias and his followers. Still Heidenheim was thoroughly conversant with what the Massoretic text ought to be according to the MSS. and the early editions. Hence, though he indicated the chapters

¹ Norzi's autograph MS. of the *Minchath-Shaï* is in the British Museum (Add. 27, 198), and it is almost needless to say that it does not contain these innovations.

בשם באמר הקאפיטולי איננו בשום ל מספר הקאפיטולי איננו בשום 2 לכן מה שאמר כאן ופרקיו ני בי החלוקה הזאת ב"י בי החלונה לא במקראות ב"י בי החלוקה מקובלת במקראות ב"י Comp. Heidenheim, חומש מאור עינים Comp. Heidenheim, חומש מאור עינים אור עינים האחרונים להכנים חולין בקרש Vol. I, p. 86, Rödelheim 1818.

by Hebrew numerals in the margin, he introduced no breaks into the text against the numbers when the chapter divisions did not coincide with the Massoretic text.

Though Dr. Baer eliminated the numbering of the chapters with the invented mnemonic signs from the Massoretic Summaries at the end of each book, yet after denouncing them as arbitrary and without any Massoretic authority, he has introduced the breaks and the numbers of the chapters into the text itself. How utterly this conflicts with the Massoretic Sections, and how extensively these divisions affect the Hebrew text will best be seen from an analysis of the chapters themselves. Leaving out the Psalms, the Hebrew Bible is divided into 779 Christian chapters. Of this total 617 coincide with one or the other of the Massoretic Sections, whilst no fewer than 162 are positively contrary to the Massorah, inasmuch as the editors who introduced them into the text have made breaks for them which are anti-Massoretic.

The portions of Dr. Baer's text which have not as yet been published are Exodus which contains nine of these anti-Massoretic chapter-breaks, Leviticus which has two, Numbers which has five, Deuteronomy which has six and Kings which has seven, making a total of twenty-nine. Deducting these from the 162 there remain 133 for the other books. Now Dr. Baer has actually followed the pernicious example of his predecessors in breaking up the text in every one of these cases, and introduced into the text itself, where there is no Massoretic division at all, not only the Hebrew letters which denote the numbers, but the equivalent Arabic numerals. Thus

In Genesis he has introduced into the text the following twenty anti-Massoretic breaks: (1) III 1; (2) VI 1;

¹ Comp. his edition of Genesis, p. 92 note.

- (3) VII 1; (4) VIII 1; (5) IX 1; (6) XIII 1; (7) XIX 1;
- (8) XXVIII 1; (9) XXIX 1; (10) XXX 1; (11) XXXI 1;
- (12) XXXII 1; (13) XXXIII 1; (14) XLII 1; (15) XLIII 1; (16) XLIV 1; (17) XLV 1; (18) XLVI 1; (19) XLVII 1

and (20) L 1.

In Joshua Dr. Baer has introduced three breaks, viz.

(i) IV 1; (2) VI 1 and (3) VII 1.

In Judges he has introduced two breaks, viz. (1) VIII 1

and (2) XVIII 1.

In Samuel he has introduced six breaks, viz. (1) VII 1;

(2) XVIII 1; (3) XXIII 1; (4) XXIV 1; (5) XXVI 1 and

(6) 2 Sam. III 1.

In Isaiah he has introduced nine breaks, viz. (1) IV 1; (2) IX 1; (3) XII 1; (4) XIV 1; (5) XVI 1; (6) XLVI 1;

(7) XLVII 1; (8) LXII 1 and (9) LXIV 1.

In Jeremiah he has introduced seven breaks, viz. (1) III 1; (2) VI 1; (3) VIII 1; (4) IX 1; (5) XX 1; (6) XXXI 1 and (7) XXXVIII 1.

In Ezekiel he has introduced eight breaks, viz. (1) IX 1;

(2) XI 1; (3) XIV 1; (4) XLI 1; (5) XLII 1; (6) XLIII 1;

(7) XLIV I and (8) XLVII I.

In the Minor Prophets he has introduced fifteen breaks, viz. (1) Hos. VI 1; (2) VII 1; (3) XI 1; (4) XIII 1; (5) XIV 1; (6) Joel IV 1; (7) Jonah II 1; (8) IV 1;

(9) Hag. II 1; (10) Zech. IV 1; (11) V 1; (12) X 1;

(13) XIII 1; (14) Mal. II 1 and (15) III 1.

In Proverbs he has introduced fifteen breaks, viz.
(1) XI 1; (2) XII 1; (3) XV 1; (4) XVI 1; (5) XVII 1;

(6) XVIII 1; (7) XIX 1; (8) XX 1; (9) XXI 1; (10) XXII 1;

(11) XXIV 1; (12) XXVI 1; (13) XXVII 1; (14) XXVIII 1 and (15) XXIX 1.

In Job he has introduced fifteen breaks, viz. (1) III 1; (2) V 1; (3) VII 1; (4) X 1; (5) XIII 1; (6) XIV 1;

(7) XVII 1; (8) XXIV 1; (9) XXVIII 1; (10) XXX 1;

(11) XXXI 1; (12) XXXIII 1; (13) XXXVII 1; (14) XXXIX 1 and (15) XLI 1.

In the Five Megilloth he has introduced nineteen breaks, viz. (1) Canticles II 1; (2) V 1; (3) VI 1; (4) VII 1; (5) VIII 1; (6) Ruth II 1; (7) III 1; (8) IV 1; (9) Eccl. II 1; (10) III 1; (11) VI 1; (12) VIII 1; (13) IX 1; (14) X 1; (15) XI 1; (16) XII 1; (17) Esther V 1; (18) VII 1 and (19) IX 1.

In Daniel he has introduced two breaks, viz. (1) IV 1 and (2) XII 1.

In Ezra-Nehemiah he has introduced two breaks, viz.
(1) Neh. VIII 1 and (2) XI 1.

In Chronicles he has introduced ten breaks, viz. (1) I Chron. XV I; (2) XXII I; (3) 2 Chron. II I; (4) III I; (5) XII I; (6) XVII I; (7) XXI I; (8) XXII I; (9) XXIV I and (10) XXVI I.

It must be distinctly understood that the question here is not whether these breaks, or any of them, are justified by the sense of the respective passages or not. They may all be in perfect harmony with the context: but what we maintain is that they are most assuredly against the Massoretic division, and as such are to be repudiated in an edition which professes to be in accordance with the Massorah.

Chap. IV.

Sedarim.

II. The Sedarim (סדרים) or the Triennial Pericopes exhibit the second division of the text. The Grammatico-Massoretic Treatise which precedes the Yemen MSS. of the Pentateuch distinctly declares that the Sedarim are the Pericopes of the Triennial cycle which obtained in many communities. "There are," it says, "places where they read through the Law in three years. Hence the Pentateuch is divided into one hundred and fifty-four Sections called Sedarim, so that one Seder is read on each Sabbath. Accordingly the Law is finished at the end of every three years." As this was the Palestinian practice (comp. Megilla 29b), and as the European communities follow the Babylonian or Annual cycle, the Sedarim which exhibit the more ancient division of the text have been totally ignored in most MSS. Even the modern editions of the so-called Massoretic Hebrew Bibles, which state at the end of each book that it contains such and such a number of Sedarim, give no indication whatever as to where, in the text, any Seder occurs.

Jacob ben Chayim, the first editor of the Bible with the Massorah (Venice 1524—25), assures us in his elaborate Introduction that if he had found this Massoretic division

ויש מקומות שמשלימין את התורה בשלוש שנים ומחלקין את התירה למאה ויש מקומות שמשלימין את התורה בשלוש שנים מדר, ונמצאי וחמשים וארבעה פרשיות והן הנקראין מדרים כדי שיקראו בכל שבת מדר, ונמצאי מדים: Or. 2348, fol. 25b; Or. 2349, fol. 16a; Or. 2364, fol. 12a; Or. 1379, fol. 21b.

of the text he would have followed it in preference to the Christian chapters which he adopted from R. Nathan's Hebrew Concordance. Having, however, obtained the List when he had nearly carried the Bible through the press he says: "I have published it separately so that it may not be lost in Israel."

But, though the Massoretic Treatise, referred to above, distinctly tells us that the Pentateuch is divided into 154 Sedarim, yet in the analysis of each book as well as in the separate enumeration of each Seder it as distinctly specifies 167 such Sedarim. Thus on Genesis it not only says that it contains 45 Sedarim,2 but gives the catchword or verse for every one of them. The same is the case with Exodus which it divides into 33 Sedarim; with Leviticus which it divides into 25 Sedarim; with Numbers which it divides into 33 Sedarim; and with Deuteronomy which it divides into 31 Sedarim. Besides this minute description and division given in the Massoretic Treatise itself, the Massorah Parva of Or. 2349 gives in the margin against the several places where such a Seder occurs in the Annual Cycle, the number of each Seder. Thus on Pericope Bereshith [= Gen. I 1-V 8] the Massorah Parva remarks on Gen. I 1 it contains four Sedarim and this is the first Seder.3 On II 4 it has סדר שני this is the second

יתן מהך עד ביי בחקנ מהביא בספרו הפרשיות בחלוקת להתמש בחלוקת להתמש בחלוקת הפרשיות שהביא בספרו רבי יצחק נתן ספר הקונקורדנצייא, ובתבתי נמשר בנביא פלוני, בשימן פלוני, למען ירוץ קורא בו. ואלו הקונקורדנצייא, ובתבתי משר בשלון בעלי המסרה בכל המקרא, הייתי יותר חפץ להשתמש ממנה מזולתה, ואחר כך הגיעה לידי לאחר שכבר כמעם השלמתי אמרתי להשתמש ממנה מזולתה, ואחר כך הגיעה לידי לאחר שכבר כמעם השלמתי מישראל: with fol. 6a-b Venice 1524—25; Jacob b. Chayim's Introduction to the Rabbinic Bible, Hebrew and English, p. 81 &c. ed. Ginsburg. London 1867-Comp. בי דע כי הספר הזה שנים עשר פרשה כללם חמשה וארבעים סדר: 2348, fol. 25b; Or. 2349, fol. 16a; Or. 2350, fol. 33b; Or. 1379, fol. 21b.

Seder. On III 22 it states סדר שלישי the third Seder and on Gen. V I it has סדר רביעי the fourth Seder. There can, therefore, be no doubt that the Massoretic School, from which these MSS. proceeded, divided the Pentateuch into 167 Sedarim. It is, however, certain that other Massoretic Schools divided it into 158 Sedarim and that others again divided it into 154.

The different divisions which obtained in the different Massoretic Schools with regard to these *Sedarim*, will best be seen when the authorities which have transmitted them are carefully analysed. And here again it is necessary to separate the Pentateuch from the Prophets and Hagiographa.

For the Pentateuch I have collated the following MSS. in the British Museum: Orient. 2348, folio 25a-29a; Orient. 2349, folio 16a-18a; Orient. 2350, folio 23a-28a; Orient. 2364, folio 12a-13a, and Orient. 1379, folio 21a-24b. The five MSS. of the Pentateuch are from Yemen and are preceded by the Grammatico-Massoretic Treatise already referred to. It is from these MSS. together with the List in the Madrid MS. No. 1 that I have printed the Summary of contents at the end of every hebdomadal Lesson (פרשה). I have moreover collated the special Lists in Orient. 2201, folio 2a-3a; Orient. 4227, folio 273a - b, and Add. 15251, folio 2a - b, as well as the printed List in the first edition of Jacob b. Chayim Rabbinic Bible Vol. 1, folio 6a, Venice 1524-25. Orient. 2201 which is dated A. D. 1246 is of special importance since it not only has a separate List of the Sedarim, but marks every Seder in the margin of the text itself with D against the place where it begins, thus leaving no doubt as to which verse it belongs. The same is the case with Oriental 2451 which contains the Pentateuch, the Haphtaroth and the Psalms. In this MS., which is in a Persian hand, the Sedarim are also marked in the margin of the text.

Genesis. - Not only do all the five Yemen MSS. state that this book has forty-five Sedarim, but they give the Pericope and verse for each Seder. Even Or. 2201 which gives in the List forty-three Sedarim, states in the Massoretic Summary at the end of Genesis (folio 27b) that Genesis has (סדרים מ"ה) forty-five Sedarim. The variations in the other MSS. are as follows: (1) The sixth Seder, viz. VIII 1 which is given in all the five Yemen MSS. and in all the Lists, is omitted in the margin of the text in Oriental 2201 and in the editio princeps. (2) The ninth Seder, viz. XI I which is not only given in all the five Yemen MSS., but is marked in the margin of the text in Oriental 2201 is omitted in all the Lists and by Dr. Baer. (3) There is no Seder given for XII ; in the Yemen MSS. and in the List in Oriental 4227, though it is marked in the margin of the text in Oriental 2201 and is given in the Lists of Oriental 2201, of Add. 15251, of the editio princeps and of Dr. Baer. (4) XVII I which is given in all the Lists as the fourteenth Seder is not marked in the Yemen MSS. nor in the text of Oriental 2201. (5) XXI 22 is marked in the margin of the text in Oriental 2201 instead of XXII 1, which is given not only in all the other MSS., but in the List of this very MS. (6) XXII 20 which is given in all the five Yemen MSS. as the nineteenth Seder is not given in any of the Lists, nor is it marked in the text in Oriental 2201. (7) XL 1 is not only given in all the five Yemen MSS. as the thirty-sixth Seder, but is marked in the margin of the text in Oriental 2201. It is, however, omitted in all the Lists and by Dr. Baer. And (8) XLIX 27 which is given in all the five Yemen MSS, and is marked in the margin of the text, both in Oriental 2201 and Oriental 2451, is omitted in all the Lists and by Dr. Baer.

It is to be regreted that Oriental 2451, which marks the Sedarim in the margin of the text and manifestly exhibits a Persian recension, is imperfect. Of the twenty-three *Sedarim*, marked in the Massorah Parva, eighteen coincide with our recension, two, viz. XL I and XLIX 27, support the Yemen recension, whilst three, viz. XXVI 13; XLII I and 9, have hitherto been unknown.

Exodus. - Both in the Summary of the contents of Exodus and in the specific references to each Seder all the five Yemen MSS., and Orient. 2451 state that this book has thirty-three Sedarim. As Add. 15251, Orient. 4227 and the printed List distinctly state that it has 29 Sedarim, whilst the List of Orient. 2201 as distinctly enumerates 27, it is evident that the three different Lists proceed from different Massoretic Schools. In the text itself, however, Orient. 2201 marks 30 Sedarim which approximates more nearly to the Yemen recension. The following analysis will show wherein these recensions differ: (1) The second Seder, viz. Exod. II 1, which is given in all the five Yemen MSS., is omitted in Add. 15251, Orient. 4227, Or. 2201, both in the text and in the List, in Oriental 2451 and in the printed List. (2) The sixteenth Seder, viz. Exod. XIX 6 is omitted in the List of Orient. 2201. (3) The ninteenth Seder, viz. Exod. XXIII 20, which is not only given in all the five Yemen MSS., but is marked in the margin of the text in Or. 2201 and Or. 2451, is omitted in Add. 15251, Or. 4227, in the List of Or. 2201 and in the printed List. (4) The twentyfifth Seder, viz. Exod. XXXI, is omitted in the text of Or. 2201. (5) The twenty-eighth Seder, viz. Exod. XXXIV 1, which is given in all the five Yemen MSS, and is marked in the margin of the text in Or. 2451, is omitted in Add. 15251, Orient. 4227, Orient. 2201, both in the text and in the List, as well as in the printed List. (6) The twentyninth Seder, viz. Exod. XXXIV 27 is omitted in the List of Orient. 2201 and in the printed List, whilst (7) the thirtieth Seder, viz. Exod. XXXIV 30 is omitted in Add. 15251, Orient. 4227, in the List of Orient. 2201 and in the printed List.

The Persian recension, though like the Yemen MSS., says in the Massoretic Summary at the end of Exodus that it has thirty-three *Sedarim*, yet marks 34 in the Massorah Parva. This recension omits two *Sedarim*, viz. Exod. II 1; XVI 4 and has three which do not exist in our recension, viz. IX 1; XII 1 and XXXVI 8.

Leviticus. - It is equally certain that the difference in the List of Sedarim extended also to Leviticus. Thus whilst all the five Yemen MSS. distinctly state in the Summary that this book has twenty-five Sedarim and minutely enumerates each Seder under every Pericope, yet Orient. 15251, Orient. 4227, Orient. 2801 in the List and the printed List give the number as twenty-three. And though Orient. 2201 also marks twenty-three in the text, the Sedarim differ in several instances from the separate List in this very MS. These differences will be best understood by the following analysis: (1) Seder 3, viz. Levit. V 1, which is given in all the five Yemen MSS., is omitted in Add. 15251, Or. 4227, Or. 2201, both in the text and in the List, and in the printed List. (2) Levit. V 20 is marked as a Seder in the text of Orient. 2201, but is not given in any of the other MSS., nor in the List of this very MS. (3) The same is the case with Levit. XXII I which is marked as a Seder in Or. 2201, but is not given in any of the other MSS., nor in the List of this MS. itself. (4) Levit. XXII 17 which is given as a Seder in all the other MSS., as well as in the List of Orient. 2201, is not marked in the text of this MS. (5) The twentieth Seder, viz. Levit. XXIII 9 which is given in all the five Yemen. MSS., is omitted in Add. 15251, Or. 4227, Orient. 2201, both in the text and in the List, and in the printed List. (6) Leviticus XXIII 15 is marked as a Seder in Add. 15251,

Orient. 4227, Orient. 2201, both in the text and in the List, as well as in the printed List, but is omitted in all the five Yemen MSS., whilst (7) the twenty-third Seder, which is given in all the other MSS. as well as in the List of Orient. 2201, is omitted in the text of this MS. According to the statement at the end of Leviticus the Persian recension preserved in Oriental 2451, Leviticus has only twenty-three Sedarim. But, though it agrees with the ordinary Lists as far as the number is concerned, it differs in the places where these Sedarim occur. The extent of this difference, however, cannot be fully ascertained, since it only marks nineteen out of the twenty-three in the Massorah Parva. The six Sedarim which are not marked are as follows: XXII 17, XXIII 9, XXIV 1, XXV 14, 35 and XXVI 3. Two of these are from the Yemen recension, viz. XXIII 9 and XXIV 1. From the ordinary recension, therefore, there are only four not marked. But in the nineteen which this MS. gives, there are two variations, both from the Yemen and ordinary recensions. Thus it omits the fourth Seder = VI 12 which all the other MSS. mark, whilst it gives XVI I as the thirteenth Seder which is not to be found in any of the other Lists.

Numbers. — Though the Yemen recension has only one Seder more in Numbers than the other recensions, yet the Lists exhibit variations in other respects as will be seen from the following analysis: (1) The sixth Seder, viz. VI 1 which is given in all the five Yemen MSS., is omitted in Add. 15251, Or. 4227, Or. 2201, both in the text and in the List, as well as in the printed List. (2) The tenth, (3) eleventh and (4) seventeenth Sedarim, viz. Numb. X 1; XI 16 and XVII 16, are omitted in the text of Or. 2201, though they are given in the List of this MS. (5) Numb. XVIII 25 is given as a Seder in Add. 15251, Or. 4227, Or. 2201, both

in the text and in the List, as well as in the printed List, but is no Seder in any of the five Yemen MSS., whilst (6) the eighteenth Seder, viz. Numb. XIX I which is given in all the five Yemen MSS., is omitted in Add. 15251, Or. 4227, Or. 2201, both in the text and in the List, and in the printed List. (7) The twentieth and (8) twenty-second Sedarim, viz. Numb. XXII 2 and XXV I, are omitted in the text of Or. 2201, but given in the List of this MS.

As Or. 2451 which is defective after Number XXVIII 28, marks only twenty-six out of the thirty-three Sedarim. The variations exhibited in these twenty-six Sedarim are as follows: (1) It marks the second Seder against II 10 and not against II 1, which is given both in the Yemen MSS. and in the ordinary Lists. (2) Like the ordinary Lists it does not mark VI 1, which is the sixth Seder in the Yemen MSS. And (3) it agrees with the ordinary recension in giving XVIII 25 as the seventeenth Seder which is omitted in the Yemen MSS. The printed Massorah at the end of Numbers has it מוסדריו ל"ב, ס"א וסדריו כ"ח.

Deuteronomy. — In Deuteronomy, too, we have two recensions of the Lists of Sedarim. The Yemen recension, which is given in all the five Yemen MSS., distinctly states that this book contains thirty-one Sedarim, and the Lists minutely give the verse of every Seder in each Pericope, whilst the recension in the other MSS. give twenty Sedarim which are duly numbered. The following analysis will show the differences in these recensions. Four Sedarim, viz. Nos. 5, 13, 18 and 20, i. e. Deut. IV 25; XIII 2; XVIII 14 and XXI 10, which are given in the Lists of all the five Yemen MSS., are omitted in the Lists of Add. 15251, Oriental 4227, Oriental 2201, both in the List and in the text, as well as in the printed List; whilst Seder No. 24 is omitted in the text of Oriental 2201, but is contained in the List of this MS. Oriental 2451 is defective. It

begins with Deuteronomy XI 18 and ends with XXXII 7. As it only marks one *Seder*, viz. XXXI 14 it is impossible to say whether the Persian recension had any variations in this book.

As to the relation of the *Sedarim* to the Open and Closed Sections, 151 out of 167 coincide with one or the other of these Sections. Only 16 have no corresponding break in the text. They are as follows:

12 in Genesis, viz. Sedarim

- (1) No. 6 = chap. VIII 1:
- (2) No. 9 = chap. XI 1;
- (3) No. 15 = chap. XIX 1:
- (4) No. 2 = chap. XXIV 42;
- (5) No. 25 = chap. XXVII 28:
- (6) No. 26 = chap. XXVIII 10:
- (7) No. 27 = chap. XXIX 31;
- (8) No. 28 = chap. XXX 22:
- (9) No. 29 = chap. XXXI 3;
- (10) No. 38 = chap. XLI 38;
- (11) No. 39 = chap. XLII 18;
- (12) No. 40 = chap. XLIII 12.
- 1 in Exodus, viz. No. 16 = chap. XIX 6;
- 1 in Leviticus, viz. No. 22 = chap. XXV 14;
- 1 in Numbers, viz. No. 21 = chap. XXIII 10; and
- 1 in Deuteronomy, viz. No. 18 = chap. XVIII 14.

For the Former Prophets I have collated the following MSS.: Orient. 2210 and Orient. 2370. These are Yemen MSS. and give the *Sedarim* in the margin of the text against the verse which commences the *Seder*. I have moreover collated Or. 2201 and Harley 5720, which also give the *Sedarim* in the margin of the text against the respective passages, as well as Arundel Or. 16. This splendid MS. not only gives every *Seder* in its proper place against the text, but has a separate List of the *Sedarim* at the

end of every book, giving the verse with which each Seder begins and the number of the Seder. Besides these I have collated the List in Add. 15251 with the List in the editio princeps of Jacob b. Chayim and with Dr. Baer's Lists, given in the Appendices to the several parts of his Hebrew Bible.

Joshua. — All the MSS. agree that Joshua has fourteen Sedarim, and there is only one instance in which the Yemen MSS. exhibit a different recension. Both in the text itself and in the separate Lists the MSS., with the one exception, mark the Sedarim substantially in the same places and give the same verse for the commencement of each Seder in the respective Lists. The List published in the editio princeps of Jacob b. Chayim's Rabbinic Bible, is a faithful reproduction of the MSS. other than of Yemen recension.

The Yemen recension gives Josh. VIII 1 as the fourth Seder and omits XIV 15 which constitutes the ninth Seder in our recension, thus making up the fourteen Sedarim.

ninth Seder ויהי הגורל למטה בני יהודה XV I, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against XIV 15, and all the Lists give ושם חברון לפנים XIV 15 as the catchword. (5) He gives the eleventh Seder ויצא הנורל השני לשמעון XIX ו, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against XVIII 28, and all the Lists give וצלע האלף = XVIII 28 as the catchword. (6) He gives for the twelfth Seder וידבר יי. דבתר אלה הנחלות XX ו whereas all the MSS mark it in the margin of the text against XIX 51, and all the Lists quote simply אלה הנחלת = XIX 51 as the catchword. And (7) he gives the fourteenth Seder ויהי מימים רבים אחרי XXIII 1, whereas all the MSS, mark it in the margin of the text against XXII 34, and all the Lists give ייקראו בני ראובן = XXII 34 as the catchword. It will thus be seen that in half the number of the Sedarim in Joshua Dr. Baer's List contradicts the Massorah.

Judges. — There is no different recension preserved in the Yemen MSS. of the Sedarim in Judges. All the Codices state that this book has fourteen Sedarim and all mark the same passages where they begin. In this book too Dr. Baer in his List departs in no fewer than six out of the fourteen instances from the unanimous testimony of the Massorah, as will be seen from the following analysis: (ו) He gives ויעשו בני ישראל, דבתר כן יאבדו כל אויביך VI 1, as the fourth Seder, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against V 31, and all the Lists give כן יאבדו כל= V 31 as the catchword. (2) He gives for the fifth Seder וישכם ירובעל הוא נדעון VII I, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against VI 40, and all the Lists give ויעש אלהים כן VI 40 as the catchword. (3) He gives for the sixth Seder ויבא נדעון הירדנה VIII 4, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against VIII 3, and all the Lists give בידכם

בתן אלהים VIII 3 as the catchword. (4) He gives for the tenth Seder וירד שמשון תמנחה וירא XIV 1, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against XIII 24, and all the Lists give ותלד האשה בן XIII 24 as the catchword. (5) He gives as the eleventh Seder ויהי אחרי XVI 4, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against XVI 3, and all the Lists give simply וישכב שמשון XVI 3 as the catchword. And (6) he gives וישכב שמשון XVII 7 as the twelfth Seder, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against XVIII 6 and all the Lists give הכהן אמר להם XVIII 6 and all the Lists give הכהן אמר אמר להם XVIII 6 as the catchword. Here again Dr. Baer's List contradicts in nearly half the instances the statement of the Massorah.

Samuel. — In the MSS, and in the early editions of the Bible Samuel is not divided. Hence the Massorah treats it as one book. The Sedarim are, therefore, numbered continuously without any reference to 1 Samuel and 2 Samuel. Here too all the MSS are unanimous that Samuel has 34 Sedarim, and the Yemen recension exhibits only two variations, viz. the sixth Seder which the Yemen MSS. mark against X 25, whereas the other MSS, give it X 24 a verse earlier; and the thirteenth Seder which the Yemen MSS, mark against XX 5, whereas it is marked in the other MSS. against XX 4, also one verse earlier. In Dr. Baer's List, however, there are no fewer than fourteen deviations from the Massorah: (1) He gives for the second Seder וילך אלקנה הרמתה אל ביתו II וו, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against II 10, and all the Lists give יהוה יחתו מריבו = II 10 as the catchword. (2) He gives as the fifth Seder ויהי איש אחד מבנימין ושמו דו ${
m IX}$ ז, whereas all the MSS. mark the Seder in the margin of the text against IX 2, and all the Lists give ולו היה בן =IX 2 as the catchword. (3) He gives as the tenth Seder וישלח שאול

מלאכים אל ישי XVI וון, whereas all the MSS. mark the Seder in the margin of the text against XVI 18, and all the Lists give ויען אחד מהנערים = XVI אחד מהנערים = XVI אווא 18 as the catchword. (4) He gives as the fourteenth Seder ויקם וילך ויהונתן בא XXI ו, whereas all the MSS. mark the Seder in the margin of the text against XX 42, and all the Lists give ויאמר יהונתן לדוד = XX 42 as the catchword. (5) He gives as the seventeenth Seder ויאמר דוד לאביגל ברוך יי XXV 32, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against XXV 33, and all the Lists give וכרוך מעמך = XXV 33 as the catchword. (6) He gives as the twentieth Seder ויבא דוד אל צקלג וישלח XXX 26, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against XXX 25, and all the Lists give ויהי מהיום ההוא= XXX 25 as the catchword. (7) He gives as the twenty-first Seder ואכנר בן נר שר צבא 2 Sam. II 8, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against II 7, and all the Lists give ועתה תחוקנה = II 7 as the catchword. (8) He gives as the twenty-third Seder וישלח חירם מלך צר מלאכים V 11, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against V 10, and all the Lists give וילד דוד הלוך V 10 as the catchword. (9) He gives as the twenty-fourth Seder ויכא המלך דוד וישב VII 18, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against VII 16, and all the Lists give ונאמן ביתך וממלכתך = VII 16 as the catchword. (10) He gives as the twenty-fifth Seder ויגש יואכ והעם אשר עמו X 13, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against X 12, and all the Lists give חוק ונתחוק = X 12 as the catchword. (11) He gives as the twenty-seventh Seder ויאמר המלך אל יואב XIV 21, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against m XIII 25, and all the Lists give ויאמר המלך אל אבשלום = XIII 25 as the catchword. (12) He gives as the thirtysecond Seder ויעבר המלך הגלגלה XIX 41, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against XIX 40, and all the Lists give ויעבר כל העם = XIX 40 as the catchword. (13) He gives as the thirty-third Seder XX 6, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against XXI 7, and all the Lists give ויאמר המלך = XXI 7 as the catchword. And (14) he gives as the thirty-fourth Seder ואלה דברי דוך האחרנים XXIII 1, whereas all the MSS. mark the Seder in the margin of the text against XXII 51, and all the Lists give מנדיל ישועות = XXII 51 as the catchword.

Kings. - Like Samuel, the division of Kings into two books, so far as the Hebrew text is concerned, is of modern origin. It does not occur in the MSS. nor in the early editions. The Massorah treats it as one book, and in the enumeration of the Sedarim the numbers are continuous. The separate Lists in Oriental 15251, Arundel Oriental 16, as well as the one in the editio princeps of Jacob b. Chayim's Rabbinic Bible, enumerate thirty-five Sedarim in the Book of Kings. This is more or less confirmed by the following MSS.: Oriental 2370, Oriental 2210, Arund. Oriental 16, Harley 5720 and Oriental 2201, which mark the Sedarim in the margin of the text against the respective verses with which they begin. The two Yemen MSS., however, exhibit several variations which have been preserved by the School of Massorites to which they belong. Thus Seder thirteen, viz. XV 9 is a verse earlier, viz. verse 8. For Seder twenty-one which in our recension is 2 Kings IV 26, the Yemen recension gives אול הרם לך ביאמר הרם ל Kings VI 6, which is also marked as Seder in the margin of the text in Oriental 2201. Seder thirty is also a verse earlier, viz. XVIII 5 instead of XVIII 6, whilst the following six Sedarim are not marked at all: No. 7 = VIII 11; No. 21 =. 2 Kings IV 26; No. 25 = 2 Kings X 15; No. 32 = 2 Kings XX 8; No. 34 = 2 Kings XXIII 25 and No. 35 = 2 Kings XXIV 18.

For the Latter Prophets I have collated the following MSS.: Oriental 2211 which is the only Yemen MS. of the Latter Prophets in the British Museum, and it is greatly to be regretted that I have not been able to find another MS. of this School, since it exhibits a recension of the Sedarim different in many respects from that preserved in the other Codices. I have also collated Oriental 2201, Harley 5720 and Arundel Oriental 16, which also mark the Sedarim in the margin of the text. Besides these I have collated the separate Lists in Add. 15251, Arundel Oriental 16 and in the editio princeps of Jacob b. Chayim's Rabbinic Bible with Dr. Baer's Lists given in the Appendices to the several parts of his Hebrew Bible.

Isaiah. — All the Codices and the separate Lists mark the Sedarim in Isaiah as twenty-six in number. The Yemen recension, however, preserved in Oriental 2211 exhibits very striking variations. Thus in more than half the instances the Sedarim which are marked in the margin of the text are in different places: (ו) The second Seder is אמרו צדיק = III 10 instead of IV 3. (2) The fourth Seder is VIII 13 instead of VI 3. (3) The tenth Seder is XXV 8 instead of XXV 1. (4) The twelfth Seder is XXX 8 instead of XXIX 23. (5) The thirteenth Seder is XXXII 17 instead of XXXII 18. (6) The sixteenth Seder is XXXIX 8 instead of XL 1. (7) The eighteenth Seder is XLIII 31 instead of XLIV 6. Harley 5720 has also this Seder in XLIII 31. (8) The twentieth Seder is XLVIII 9 instead of XLVIII 2. (9) The twenty-first Seder is LI 11 instead of XLIX 26. (10) The twenty-second Seder is LIV 10 instead of LII 7. (11) The twenty-third Sedex is LVII 14 instead of LV 13. (12) The twenty-fourth Seder is LIX 20 instead of LVIII 14. Harley 5720 has also this Seder on LIX 20. (13) The twentyfifth Seder is LXIII 7 instead of LXI 9, (14), whilst the twenty-sixth Seder is LXV 16 instead of LXV 9.

Dr. Baer, who professes to give the received List, has in no fewer than nineteen instances altered the Massorah. Thus (1) for the second Seder he gives אם רחץ אדני את צאת בנות ציון IV 4, whereas all the MSS., with the exception of course of the Yemen Codex, put the Seder against IV 3 in the margin of the texts, and the Lists give והיה הנשאר בציון = IV 3 as the catchword. (2) He gives the third Seder וינען אמות הספים VI 4, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against VI 3, and all the Lists give וקרא זה אל זה = VI 3 as the catchword. (3) He gives the fourth Seder דבר שלח יי ביעקב IX 7, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against IX 6, and all the Lists give לם רבה המשרה = IX 6 as the catchword. (4) He gives as the fifth Seder ויצא חשר מגוע ישי XI I, whereas all the MSS. with the exception of Harley 5720, mark it in the margin of the text against XI 2, and all the Lists give ונחה עליו רוח יי = XI 2 as the catchword. (5) He gives as the sixth Seder והיה ביום הניח יי לך XIV 3, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against XIV 2, and all the Lists give ולקחום עמים = XIV 2 as the catchword. (6) He gives as the eighth Seder בשנת בא תרתן אשדודה XX 1, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against XIX 25, and all the Lists give אשר ברכו יהוה = XIX 25 as the catchword. (7) He gives as the ninth Seder משא צר הילילו אניות XXIII I, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against XXII 23, and all the Lists give ותקעתיו יתר= XXII 23 as the catchword. (8) He gives as the tenth Seder יי אלהי אתה ארוממך 'XXV ו, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against XXIV 23, and all the Lists give וחפרה הלבנה = XXIV 23 as the catchword. (9) He gives as the eleventh Seder הוי עמרת נאות XXVIII 1, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against XXVII 13, and all the Lists give והיה ביום ההוא = XXVII ו as the catchword. (10) He gives

as the twelfth Seder הוי בנים סוררים XXX I, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against XXIX 23, and all the Lists give כי בראתו ילדיו = XXIX 23 as the catchword. (11) He gives as the fourteenth Seder ניהי בארבע עשרה שנה XXXVI I, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against XXXV 10, and all the Lists give ופרוי יי יהוה ישבון = XXXV 10 as the catchword. (12) He gives as the fifteenth Seder וישלח ישעיהו בן אמוץ XXXVII 21, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against XXXVII 20, and all the Lists give ועתה יי אלהינו XXXVII 20 as the catchword. (13) He gives as the nineteenth Seder כי כה, דבתר ישראל נושע XLV 18, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against XLV 17, and all the Lists give ישראל נושע ביי = XLV וז as the catchword. (14) He gives as the twentieth Seder הראשנות מאז הגרתי XLVIII 3, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against XLVIII 2, and all the Lists give בי מעיר הקדש $= ext{XLVIII}$ 2 as the catchword. (15) He gives as the twenty-first Seder בה מפר כריתות אי זה כפר נה L ב, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against m XLIX 26, and all the Lists give והאכלתי את מוניך=
m XLIX 26 as the catchword. (16) He gives as the twenty-third Seder בה אמר יי שמרו משפט LVI ו, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against LV 13, and all the Lists give תחת הנעצויע = LV ו as the catchword. (17) He gives as the twenty-fourth Seder הן לא קצרה יד יי LIX ו, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against LVIII 14, and all the Lists give או תתענג – LVIII 14 as the catchword. (18) He gives as the twenty-fifth Seder שוש אשיש ביי LXI 10, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against LXI 9, and all the Lists give בווים = LXI 9 as the catchword. And (19) he gives as the twenty-sixth Seder מצא התירוש ימצא יי אמר יי באשר LXV~8,whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text

against LXV $_9$, and all the Lists give והוצאתי מיעקב = LXV $_9$ as the catchword.

Jeremiah. - Both in the margin of the text and in the Lists of our recension the number of Sedarim in Jeremiah is given as thirty-one. The recension preserved in the Yemen Codex Or. 2211, however, not only gives twenty-eight, omitting XXIII 6, XXIX 18 and LI 10 marked in our Lists Nos. 12, 22 and 30, but has the following important deviations: (1) The second Seder is III 12 instead of III 4. (2) The third Seder is V 18 instead of V 1. (3) The sixth Seder is XI 5 instead of IX 23. (4) The tenth Seder is XIX 14 instead of XVIII 19. (5) The eleventh Seder is XXII 16 instead of XX 13. (6) The fourteenth Seder is XXVI 15 instead of XXVI 1. (7) The eighteenth Seder is XXXI 35 instead of XXXI 33. (8) The nineteenth Seder is XXXII 41 instead of XXXII 22. (9) The twentieth Seder is XXXIII 26 instead of XXXIII 15. (10) The twenty-eighth Seder is XLIX 2 instead of XLVIII 12; (11) whilst the twenty-ninth Seder is L 20 instead of L 5. Of the twenty-eight Sedarim, therefore, which this recension gives, it coincides in seventeen passages with the received List.

In the received List there is a variation in the MSS. with regard to the twentieth Seder. The Lists in Add. 15251, and in the editio princeps give it בימים ההם תושע Jerem. XXXIII 16 and the Yemen Codex and Harley 5720 mark the Seder in the margin of the text against this verse, whilst Oriental 2201, which is one of the oldest dated MSS., marks it in the margin of the text against המם אצמים ההם אצמים ההם אצמים האמים בימים ההם אצמים האמים באצמים האם XXXIII 16 which I have adopted.

As to Dr. Baer's List, it is utterly at variance with the Massorah in no fewer than fifteen instances. (1) He gives the second Seder ויאמר יי אלי, דבתר הינמור לעולם III 6, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text

against III 4 and all the Lists give הלוא מעתה = III 4 as the catchword. (2) He gives the sixth Seder הנה ימים ואת יתהלל IX 24, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against IX 23 and the Lists give כי אם בואת = IX 23 as the catchword. (3) He gives the eighth Seder ויאמר יי אלי. דבתר היש בהבלי ארוים XV I, which I have inadvertantly followed, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against XIV 22 and all the Lists give היש בהבלי הגוים = XIV 22 as the catchword. (4) He gives the twelfth Seder לכן הנה ימים באים, דבתר יהודה XXIII 7, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against XXIII 6 and the Lists give בימיו תושע יהודה = XXIII 6 as the catchword. (5) He gives the thirteenth Seder הדבר אשר היה, דבתר ושלחתי בם את החרב XXV I, whereas all the MSS., with the exception of the Yemen Codex, mark it in the margin of the text against XXIV 7 and the Lists give ונתתי להם לב = XXIV 7 as the catchword. (6) He gives the fifteenth Seder בראשית ממלכת יהויקם XXVII 1, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against XXVII 5 and all the Lists give אנכי עשיתי את = XXVII 5 as the catchword. (ק) He gives the sixteenth Seder כי כה אמר יי דבתר ודרשו את שלום XXIX 8, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against XXIX 7 and all the Lists give ודרשו את שלום = XXIX 7 as the catchword. (8) He gives the seventeenth Seder ואתה אל תירא עברי, דבתר ועבדו את " XXX וס, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against XXX 9 and all the Lists give ועבדו את יהוה = XXX g as the catchword. (g) He gives the nineteenth Seder ויהי דבר יי, דבתר ואתה אמרת אלי XXXII 26, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against XXXII 22 and all the Lists give ותחו להם את הארץ = XXXII בי as the catchword. (10) He gives the twentieth Seder כי כה אמר יי דבתר בימים ההם תושע

XXXIII 17, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text either against XXXIII 15 or 16 and all the Lists give בימים ההם תושע = XXXIII וו as the catchword. (וו) He gives the twenty-first Seder ויהי דבר יי, דבחר ונשב בירושלם XXXV 12, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against XXXV 10 and all the Lists give ונשב באהלים = XXXV 10 as the catchword. (12) He gives the twenty-second Seder ויהי דבר יי, דבתר ויצוה המלך את ירחמאל XXXVI 27, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against XXXVI 26 and all the Lists give ויצוה המלך את = XXXVI 26 as the catchword. (13) He gives the twenty-fourth Seder הדבר אשר היה, דבתר כי מלט אמלשך XL I, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against XXXIX 18 and all the Lists give כי מלט אמלשך = XXXIX ו8 as the catchword. (14) He gives the twenty-sixth Seder ויאמר ירמיהו אל כל העם XLIV 24, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against XLIV 20. (15) He gives the twenty-eighth Seder לבני עמון כה אמר יי XLIX ו, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against XLVII 12 and all the Lists give לכן הנה ימים באים XLVIII ו2 as the catchword.

Ezekiel. — According to the ordinarily received Lists, Ezekiel has twenty-nine Sedarim. In the Yemen recension, however, preserved in Oriental 2211, there are only twenty-eight, the twelfth Seder, viz. XX 41 being omitted. There are also the following two variations: (1) The fifth Seder is X 1 instead of X 9 and (2) the twenty-seventh Seder is XLIV 4 instead of XLIII 27.

Dr. Baer's List exhibits the following twelve departures from the Massorah: (1) He gives for the thirteenth Seder איר דבר יי, דבתר ונחלת בך XXII 17, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against XXII 16 and all the Lists give ונחלת בך לעיני =XXII 16 as the catchword. (2) He gives the fourteenth Seder כי כה אמר, דבתר

והשכתי ומי(?)ממך XXIII 28, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against XXIII 27 and all the Lists give והשכתי ומתך ממך XXIII 27 as the catchword. (3) He gives the fifteenth Seder ואתה בן אדם, דבתר והיה יחוקאל לכם XXIV 25, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against XXIV 24 and all the Lists give והיה יחוקאל לכם = XXIV 24 as the catchword. (4) He gives the sixteenth Seder ויהי דבר יי, דבתר בלהות אתנך XXVII I, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against XXVI 20 and all the Lists give והורדתיך את יורדי =XXVI 20 as the catchword. (5) He gives the seventeenth Seder ויהי דבר יי, דבעדן גן אלהים היית XXVIII 11, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against XXVIII ו and all the Lists give בערן נן אלהים XXVIII 13 as the catchword. (6) He gives the eighteenth Seder ויהי דבר יי, דבתר ביום ההוא אצמיח XXX ו, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against XXIX 21 and all the Lists give ביום ההוא אצמיה XXIX 21 as the catchword. (7) He gives the twentieth Seder ויהי בשתי עשרה שנה, דבתר כל חטאתו XXXIII 21, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against XXXIII וה and all the Lists give כל חשאתו אשר =XXXIII 16 as the catchword. (8) He gives the twentyfirst Seder וכרתי להם ברית שלום XXXIV 25, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against XXXIV 26 and all the Lists give ונתתי אותם וסביבות = XXXIV 26 as the catchword. (9) He gives the twenty-third Seder ויהי דבר יי, דגוג ארץ המגוג XXXVIII ו, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against XXXVII 28 and all the Lists give וידעו הנוים כי אני XXXVII 28 as the catchword. (10) He gives the twenty-seventh Seder וישב אתי דרך שער המקדש XLIV $_{\rm I},$ whereas all the MSS.

¹ The $\dot{\Xi}$ has unfortunately dropped out of the margin in my edition.

53

The Minor Prophets — According to the MSS. and the separate Lists, both MS. and printed, the Minor Prophets, which are grouped together as one book, have twenty-one Sedarim. In the received number, however, there is the following variation. The nineteenth Seder is marked in the margin of the text in Oriental 2201 against Zechariah VIII 4 instead of VIII 23 as in all the other MSS. and Lists. For the twentieth Seder, viz. Zech. XII 1, Add. 15251 and the editio princeps give the catchword משא דבר " דנינוה as מא the other is the catchword in Arundel Or. 16.

The Yemen recension preserved in Oriental 2211 has only nineteen Sedarim in the Minor Prophets and exhibits the following variations: (1) It has a Seder on Hosea II 22 which is not in the received recension. (2) The fifth Seder is Joel IV 8 instead of II 27. (3) The seventh is Amos V 15 instead of V 14. (4) The tenth is Jonah IV 11 instead of Micah I 1. (5) The eleventh is Micah IV 7 instead of Micah IV 5. (6) The thirteenth is Habakkuk I 12 instead of I 1 and (7) the fourteenth Seder is Zeph. I 4 instead of I 1.

Dr. Baer's List has the following fifteen departures from the Massorah: (τ) He gives the second Seder לכו ונשובה

אל " Hosea VI 1, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against VI 2 and all the Lists give יחיינו מימים = VI 2 as the catchword. (2) He gives the fourth Seder דבר יי אשר היה אל יואל Joel I I, whereas the Massorah at the end of Joel distinctly declares that this book has one Seder only (סידרא דורא) and gives II 27 as the Seder in question and all the Lists give וידעתם כי קרב = Joel II 27 as the catchword. The actual fourth Seder is given in all the MSS. and Lists אהיה כטל Hosea XIV 6. He gives the fifth Seder והיה אחרי כן אשפוך Joel III 1, whereas all the MSS. and all the Lists give Joel II 27 as the fifth Seder. (4) He gives the sixth Seder דברי עמום Amos I 1, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against Amos II 10 and all the Lists give ואנכי העליתי= Amos II 10 as the catchword. (5) He gives the eighth Seder חוון עבדיה Obadiah ו, whereas all the MSS. mark the Seder on Amos VII 15 and all the Lists give ייקחני יי מאחר = Amos VII ון as the catchword. (6) He gives the ninth Seder ויהי דבר יי אל יונה Jonah I. I, contrary to the Massorah which says at the end of Jonah that (לית ביה סדרא) it has no Seder. All the MSS. mark this Seder in the margin of the text against Obadiah 21 and all the Lists give ועלו מושעים Obadiah 21 as the catchword. (7) He gives the eleventh Seder ביום ההוא, דבתר כי כל העמים ילכו Micah IV 6, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against IV 5 and all the Lists give כי כל העמים =IV 5 as the catchword. (8) He gives the twelfth Seder משא נינוה ספר Nahum I ו contrary to the Massorah which distinctly says at the end of Nahum that לית ביה סדרא), it has no Seder. All the MSS. mark this Seder in the margin of the text against Micah VII 20 and all the Lists give תהן אמת ליעקב Micah VII 20 as the catchword. (9) He gives the fifteenth Seder בשנת שתים לדריויש דריש חג Hag. I 1, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the

margin of the text against Zeph. III 20 and all the Lists give בעת ההוא אביא Zeph. III 20 as the catchword. (10) He gives the sixteenth Seder בחדש השמיני בשנת Zech. I ו, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against Habakkuk II 23 and all the Lists give ביום ההוא נאם יי Hab. II 23 as the catchword. (11) He gives the seventeenth Seder וישב המלאך הדבר, דויאמר אלי מה אתה ראה Zech. IV 1, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against IV 2 and all the Lists give ויאמר אלי מה אתה ראה = IV 2 as the catchword. (12) He gives the eighteenth Seder ויהי בשנת ארבע לדריוש Zech. VII 1, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against VI 14 and all the Lists give והעמרת תהיה = VI 14 as the catchword. (13) He gives the nineteenth Seder כה אמר יי, דהנני מושיע Zech. VIII 7, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against VIII 23 and all the Lists give כה אמר יי צבאות בימים = VIII 23 as the catchword. (14) He gives the twentieth Seder משא דבר " בארץ חדרך Zech. IX 1, whereas all the MSS. with the exception of Oriental 2201, mark it in the margin of the text against XII 1 and all the Lists give משא דבר יי דנמה = XII ו as the catchword. And (ובר יי ביד Seder משא דבר יי ביד מלאכי Malachi I ו, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against Zech. XIV 21 and all the Lists give והיה כל סיר XIV 21 as the catchword.

The Hagiographa.—For the Hagiographa I have collated the following MSS.: Oriental 2374 and Oriental 2375 both of which are Yemen; Oriental 2201, Oriental 4237, Harley 5710—11, Arundel Or. 16 and Add. 15251 as well as the Lists of the editio princeps in the Rabbinic Bible by Jacob ben Chayim.

The Psalms. — Both the notes in the margin of the text in the MSS. and the separate Lists give the number of Sedarim in the Psalms as nineteen. It is very remarkable

that the Sedarim preserved in the Yemen MSS. exhibit features peculiar to the Psalter. Thus the Sedarim in Oriental 2375 are identical with those in our recension, whilst those preserved in Codex 2374 are totally different. Though several leaves are missing yet this MS. has preserved no fewer than sixteen Sedarim, not one of which coincides with the received number, as will be seen from the following List. Thus Seder (1) is Ps. XXXV 1; (2) is XXXVIII 1; (3) is LIX 1; (4) is LXV 1; (5) is LXIX 1; (6) is LXXVIII 1; (7) is LXXXX 1; (8) is LXXXVII 1; (9) is XCVII 1; (10) is CIV 1; (11) is CXI 1; (12) is CXIX 1; (13) is CXIX 89; (14) is CXXX 1; (15) is CXXXXIX 1 and (16) is CXLIV 1.

As to Dr. Baer's List, it contains the following thirteen departures from the Massorah: (1) He gives the second Seder יי למנצח על השמינית, דבתר כי צדיק יי Ps. XII 4 [?], whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against XI $_7$ and all the Lists give כי צדיק = XI $_7$ as the catchword. (2) As regards the third Seder, Oriental 2201 and Oriental 2211 mark it in the margin of the text against Ps. XX 10 and this is confirmed by all the three Lists, viz. Add. 15251, Oriental 4227 and the editio princeps, whereas Harley 5710-11 and Arundel Oriental 16 mark it against Ps. XXI 1, which is followed by Dr. Baer. (3) Dr. Baer gives the fourth Seder יי עז למוי, a mistake for לעמו, Ps. XXX I, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against XXIX II and all the Lists give יי עו לעמר יחן = XXIX אוו as the catchword. (4) He gives the fifth Seder למנצח לעבד, דבתר ולשוני תהנה Ps. XXXVI I, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against XXXV 28 and all the Lists give ולשוני תהנה צדקך = XXXV 28 as the catchword. (5) He gives the sixth Seder Ps. XLII 1, whereas all למנצח משכיל, דבתר ברוך יי אלהי ישראל the MSS, mark it in the margin of the text against

XLI 14 and all the Lists give ברוך יי אלהי שראל = XLI 14 as the catchword. (6) He gives the seventh Seder מומור רבתר אדם ביקר ולא יבין Ps. L 1, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against XLIX 19 and all the Lists give כי נפשו בחייו = XLIX 19 as the catchword. (7) He gives the eighth Seder למנצח אל תשחת, דבתר רומה על שמים Ps. LVIII I, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against LVII and all the Lists give רומה על שמים LVII 12 as the catchword. (8) He gives the tenth Seder מזמור לאסף, דבתר Ps. LXXIII ו, which I have inadvertandly followed, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against LXXII 20 and all the Lists give בלו תפלות דוך = LXXII 20 as the catchword. (9) He gives the twelfth Seder למנצח לבני קרח, דבתר יי צבאות אשרי אדם Ps. LXXXV 1, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against LXXXIV 13 and all the Lists give יי צבאות אשרי באות אשרי LXXXIV ו as the catchword. (10) He gives the thirteenth Seder תפלה למשה איש האלהים Ps. XC 1, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against XC ויהי נעם = XC 17 as the catchword. Though I have given the Seder on XC 17 in accordance with the MSS. I have inadvertandly also left it standing against XC 1. (11) He gives the fifteenth Seder ישראל יי ברוך יי אלהי ישראל Ps. CVII ו, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against CV 45 and all the Lists give בעבור ישמרו= CV 45 as the catchword. (12) He gives the sixteenth Seder הללויה אשרי איש, דבתר ראשית חכבה Ps. CXII I, which I inadvertandly followed, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against CXI 10 and all the Lists give האשית חכמה = CXI 10 as the catchword. And (13) he gives the seventeenth Seder ידיך עשוני ויכוננוני Ps. CXIX 73, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against as the catchword.

CXIX 72 and all the Lists give מוב לי תורת = CXIX 72

Dr. Baer's List has the following two departures from the Massorah. Thus Dr. Baer gives the third Seder לד IX ובמת חכמת הכמת לך IX ו2, which I have inadvertandly followed, whereas all the MSS., with the exception of Arundel Or. 16, mark it in the margin of the text against IX 11 and all the Lists give כי ירבו ימיך IX 11 as the catchword. And (2) he gives the sixth Seder אל תנול דל XXII 22, which I inadvertandly followed, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against XXII 21 and all the Lists give להודיעך קשט XXII 21 as the catchword.

Job. – This book too has eight Sedarim which are duly marked, both in the margin of the text and in the separate Lists. Arundel Oriental 16, which carefully marks each Seder in the text, has no separate List at the end of this book. It moreover exhibits the following variation: The sixth Seder, which is marked in the margin of all the other MSS. against XXIX 14 and is so given in all the separate Lists, is in this MS. marked against Type XXIX 15.

As to the two Yemen MSS., Oriental 2375 coincides exactly with the received List, whilst Oriental 2374, in which a few leaves are missing, both at the beginning and at the end of Job, marks in the margin of the text the following eight Sedarim which are entirely at variance with our recension: (1) Job VIII 7. (2) XII 12. (3) XV 19. (4) XIX 25. (5) XXIII 1. (6) XXXIX 1. (7) XXXII 8 and (8) XXXVI 16. Against Job I 1 the D has dropped out from the margin in my edition.

Dr. Baer's List has the following four departures from the Massorah: (1) Dr. Baer gives the second Seder ויען איוב, דבתר הנה זאת חקרנוה m VI 1, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against V 27 and all the Lists give הנה זאת חקרנוה $\dot{=}$ V 27 as the catchword. (2) He gives the third Seder ויען איוב, דבתר ותקותם מפח נפש XII ז, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against XI ורבצת ואין מחריד = XI 19 as the catchword. (3) He gives the fifth Seder ויען איוב, דבתר ימלט אי נקי XXIII וו (a mistake for XXIII ו), whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against XXII 30 and all the Lists give ימלט אי נקי = XXII 30 as the catchword. And (4) he gives the seventh Seder ויען אליהוא, דבתר אם אין אתה שמע לי XXXIV 1, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against XXXIII 33 and all the Lists give אם אין אתה שמע = XXXIII 33 as the catchword.

The Five Migilloth. — The Massorah tells us that Canticles, Ruth and Lamentations have no Sedarim. It is, therefore, only two out of the Five Migilloth, viz. Ecclesiastes and Esther which have them. The former has four Sedarim and the latter five. This is fully confirmed, both by the Massorah Parva against each Seder and by the separate Lists.

 $^{^1}$ Oriental 4227 has, however, at the end of the List of the Sedarim (fol. 198b) the following: כל הסדרים של כתובים ששה ושמונים רות ושיר השירים 1 נינות שלשה 1 דינות שלשה 1 דינות שלשה 1

60

For the Lists I have collated Add. 15251 and Oriental 4227, as well as the editio princeps. The MSS, which have the Sedarim marked in the margin of the text and which I have collated are Oriental 2201, Oriental 2375 and Arundel Oriental 16. It is, however, to be remarked that not one of these three MSS, has the Sedarim on Esther, though they all carefully give them on Ecclesiastes. For Esther, therefore, I have been restricted to the three separate Lists. Only one of the Yemen MSS, viz. Or. 2375, marks the Sedarim which entirely coincide with the received recension.

In Ecclesiastes Dr. Baer's List deviates from the Massorah in one instance. Thus Dr. Baer gives the second Seder ידעתי כי כל, דבתר וגם כל האדם III 14,-whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against III 13 and all the Lists give וגם כל האדם III 13 as the catchword.

In Esther Dr. Baer's List coincides with the Massoretic Lists.

Daniel. — According to the Massorah, Daniel has seven Sedarim. In Oriental 2201 and Oriental 2375, however, the seventh Seder, viz. X 21 is omitted. But it is duly marked in the margin of the text in Arundel Oriental 16 and is given in all the three Lists, viz. Add. 15251, Oriental 4227 and in the editio princeps. Of the two Yemen MSS. Oriental 2375 coincides with the received recension, whilst Oriental 2374 is defective. But the fragment exhibits two variations. Thus the second Seder is III 1, instead of II 35; and the third Seder is V 1, instead of III 30.

In Dr. Baer's List there are three departures from the Massorah. Thus (i) Dr. Baer gives the second Seder II 36, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against II 35 and all the Lists give בארין דקו כחדה = II 35 as the catchword. (2) He gives the fourth Seder בארין דניאל העל V 13, whereas all the

MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against V 12 and all the Lists give דו כל קבל די רוח אחת לדריוש V 12 as the catchword. And (3) he gives the seventh Seder ואני בשנת אחת לדריוש XI 1, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against X 21 and all the Lists give אבל אניד לך אניד לד מצו as the catchword. With regard to the fifth Seder there is a variation. The three Lists give דוניאל כדי ידע אוו בי ידע אוו די אווי בי ידע אווי אווי בי ידע אווי בי ידע אווי בי ידע אווי בי ידע אווי דוניאל דנה הצלח בי ודניאל דנה הצלח לו בי ידע זו הצלח לו בי ידע אווי בי אווי אווי בי ידע אווי בי ידע אווי בי ידע אווי בי ידע זו הצלח מו מווי בי ידע זו הצלח מווי מווי בי ידע זו הצלח אווי בי ידע זו הצלח מווי בי ידע זו ווויאל וווי ווויאל אווי בי ידע זו ווויאל בונה הצלח אווי בי ידע זו וווויאל בונה הצלח מווי בי ידע זו וווויאל בונה הצלח הצלח בונה הצלח בי ידע זו וווויאל בונה הצלח בונה הצלח בונה בי ידע זו וווויאל בונה הצלח בונה בי ידע זו בונה הצלח בונה בי ידע זו בונה בי ידע בונה בי ידע בונה בי ידע בונה בי ידע זו בונה בי ידע בי ידע בי ידע בונה בי ידע בונה בי ידע בונה בי ידע בונה בי ידע בי ידע בי ידע בי ידע בי ידע

Ezra-Nehemiah. — In the MSS. and in the early editions of the Bible, Ezra and Nehemiah are not divided and the Massorah treats them as one book under the single name of Ezra. According to the Massorah Ezra, i. e. Ezra-Nehemiah has ten Sedarim. This is confirmed by the following MSS. which I have collated for this purpose: Add. 15251, Arundel Oriental 16, Oriental 4227 and the editio princeps which give separate Lists, as well as Oriental 2201, Oriental 2375 and Arundel Oriental 16, which mark the Sedarim in the margin of the text. Of the two Yemen MSS. Oriental 2374 does not mark the Sedarim in Ezra, whilst Oriental 2375 coincides with our recension, with the exception of the tenth Seder, which this MS. and Arund. Or. 16 mark in the margin of the text against Neh. XII 26 instead of XII 27.

Dr. Baer's List exhibits the following five departures from the Massorah: ($_{\rm I}$) Dr. Baer gives the second Seder representation Ezra IV $_{\rm I}$, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against III $_{\rm I3}$ and all the Lists give ואין $_{\rm I3}$ = III $_{\rm I3}$ as the catchword. ($_{\rm I3}$) He gives the third Seder ויעשו בני הגולה את הפסח VI $_{\rm I9}$, whereas all

the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against VI 18 and all the Lists give והקימו כהניא VI 18 as the catchword. (3) He gives the fifth Seder ויהי בחדש ניסן שנח Neh. II 1, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against Neh. I 11 and all the Lists give אדני חהי נא אדני חהי ווו און און און און און און מובלש ווו וווא IV 1, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against III 38 and all the Lists give אויבינו דומה EIII 38 as the catchword. And (5) he gives the seventh Seder ווהי כאשר שמעו כל אויבינו VI 16, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against VI 15 and all the Lists give החומה EVI 15 as the catchword.

Chronicles. - The division of Chronicles into two books like the division of Samuel, Kings and Ezra and Nehemiah, is of modern origin, so far as the Hebrew Bible is concerned. It does not occur in the MSS. nor in the early editions, and the Massorah treats Chronicles as a single book. Hence, in the enumeration of the Sedarim, the numbers run on without any break. According to the Massorah the book of Chronicles has twenty-five Sedarim. This is fully confirmed by the four Massoretic Lists which I have collated and which are as follows: (1) in Add. 15251; (2) Orient. 4227; (3) Arundel Oriental 16 and (4) in the editio princeps of the Rabbinic Bible by Jacob b. Chayim. I have also collated the following MSS, where the Sedarim are marked in the margin of the text: Oriental 2201; Oriental 2374; Oriental 2375; and Arundel Oriental 16; thus the latter MS. marks the Sedarim in the text, besides giving a separate List.

Oriental 2374 and Oriental 2375 are the Yemen MSS. containing the Hagiographa, and have, therefore, preserved the Yemen recension. The former marks only three of the twenty-five *Sedarim*, viz. the ninteenth, the twentieth and the twenty-fourth, and these fully coincide with our recension. The latter marks twenty-three out of the twenty-five

Sedarim. The last pages containing the twenty-fifth Seder are missing, whilst the twentieth Seder, viz. 2 Chron. XXII 11, which is duly marked in the former MS., is here not marked at all, which is evidently due to an oversight on the part of the Scribe. All the other Sedarim coincide with our recension.

The List manipulated by Dr. Baer contains the following eighteen departures from the Massorah: (1) He gives the second Seder וכלוב אבי שוחה, דבתר ויקרא יעבץ ו Chron. IV 11, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against IV 10 and all the Lists give ייקרא יעבץ = IV 10 as the catchword. (2) He gives the third Seder ואלה בני אהרן, דבתר ואהרן ובניו VI 35, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against VI 34 and all the Lists give ואהרן ובניו = VI 34 as the catchword. (3) He gives the fourth Seder וכל ישראל התיחשו, דבתר ויהיו נגי אולם IX I, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against VIII 40 and all the Lists give ויהיו בני אולם = VIII 40 as the catchword. (4) As regards the fifth Seder, for which Dr. Baer gives וילך דויד וכל ישראל XI 4, though it is supported by the Lists in Add. 15251 and in the editio princeps, it is manifestly a mistake, as is evident from Arundel Oriental 16 and Oriental 2375, both of which mark it in the margin of the text against XI 9, as well as from the Lists in Oriental 4227 and Arundel Or. 16, which give יילך דויד הלוך וגדול = XI 9 as the catchword. The mistake is due to the fact that the catchword originally was simply וילך דויך to which the Scribe added וכל ישראל instead of ויועץ. (5) Dr. Baer gives the sixth Seder ויועץ דויד, דבתר וגם הקרובים XIII ו, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against XII 41 and all the Lists give ונם הקרובים XII 41 as the catchword. (6) He gives the seventh Seder יישוב שם לפני, דבתר ברוך יי אלהי ישראל XVI 37, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against XVI 36 and all the Lists give

ברוך יי אלהי ישראל = XVI 36 as the catchword. (7) He gives the eighth Seder וינש יואב, דבתר חזק ונתחזקה XIX 14, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against XIX א and all the Lists give אוק ונתחוקה = XIX 13 as the catchword. (8) He gives the ninth Seder ודויד זקן, דבתר עתה תנו לבככם XXIII ו, whereas all the MSS, mark it in the margin of the text against XXII 19 and all the Lists give עתה תנו לכככם XXII וס as the catchword. (9) He gives the tenth Seder ולשמעיה בנו נולד בנים XXVI 6, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against XXVI 5 and all the Lists give עמיאל הששי = XXVI 5 as the catchword. (10) He gives the eleventh Seder ייתו דויד לשלמה, דבתר ראה עתה כי XXVIII 11, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against XXVIII 10 and all the Lists give עתה כי יי = XXVIII 10 as the catchword. (11) He gives the twelfth Seder וישלח שלמה אל חורם דהנה אני בונה 2 Chron. II 2, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against II 3 and all the Lists give הנה אני בונה בית = II $_3$ as the catchword. (12) He gives the thirteenth Seder אז אמר שלמה, דבתר ולא יכלו הכהנים VI 1, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against V 14 and all the Lists give ולא יכלו הכהנים = V 14 as the catchword. (13) He gives the fifteenth Seder ויהי לשלמה ארבעת, דבתר והם מביאים IX 25, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against IX 24 and all the Lists give והם מביאים איש = IX 24 as the catchword. (14) He gives the sixteenth Seder ויתחזק המלך רחבעם, דבתר ובהכנעו XII 13, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against XII 12 and all the Lists give ובהכנעו שב ממנו = XII וו as the catchword. (15) He gives the nineteenth Seder וימלד יהושפט ,דבתר ותשקט מלכות XX או, whereas all the MSS. mark it in the margin of the text against XX 30 and all

From the above analysis it will be seen that the Hebrew Bible contains 452 Sedarim, as follows: The Pentateuch has 167, the Former Prophets 97, the Latter Prophets 107 and the Hagiographa 81, i. e. 167 + 97 + 107 + 81 = 452. Deducting the 167 Sedarim in the Pentateuch and the 35 in Kings, the Lists of which have not as yet been published by Dr. Baer, we are left to deal with 250 Sedarim given by him in the Appendices to the different parts of the Prophets and Hagiographa. Of these no fewer than 126, i. e. half of the total number given by Dr. Baer, are against the Massorah as marked in the margin of the text in the MSS. and in the Lists. As this exhibits a difference between Dr. Baer's text and my edition, which extends to almost every page of the Bible, I have been obliged to give this minute analysis, not to expose Dr. Baer's departure from the Massorah, but to justify my edition.

Chap. V.

The Annual Pericopes.

III. The Annual Pericopes constitute the third division of the text of the Pentateuch. These divisions which consist of fifty-four hebdomadal lessons, are called Parashiyoth פרשה, singular פרשה, and are as follows:

Genesis	has	12
Exodus	"	ıı
Leviticus	"	10
Numbers	"	ю
Deuteronomy	22	II.

Each of these fifty-four Pericopes has a separate name which it derives from the initial word or words. With the exception of one Parasha, viz. Vayechi [יותו Gen. XLVII 28 etc.] all these Pericopes coincide with an Open or Closed Section. Hence in the Ritual Scrolls of the Pentateuch, where no letters of any kind, apart from those constituting the consonants of the text, are allowed, these hebdomadal lessons are sufficiently indicated by the prescribed sectional breaks.

In most MSS. of the Pentateuch in book form, however, יב, ים or פרש is put in the margin against the commence-

וח some MSS, there is also no sectional division between the end of Pericope הילדה, i. e. Gen. XXVIII o and the beginning of אין בין שהי פרשינת אלו 10 as is stated in the Massorah Parva of the Model Codex No. 1 in the Imperial and Royal Court Library at Vienna אין בין שהי פרשינת אלו הודיעך מה בין שהי יציאות, ואית האמרי׳ שיש.

ment of the respective Pericopes, whilst in the prescribed vacant space of the Open or Closed Section, the mnemonic sign, indicating the number of verses contained in the Parasha, is given in smaller letters. This is the case in most of the Spanish Codices. In the more ancient MSS. from South Arabia Parasha (arabia) is sometimes expressed in the vacant sectional space in large illuminated letters, followed by the mnemonic sign indicating the number of verses. The insertion of Parasha in the text, but without the mnemonie sign, was adopted in the editio princeps of the Pentateuch, Bologna, 1482.

In many MSS. especially of the German Schools, the Pericopes are indicated by three Pes () in the vacant space in the text with or without the mnemonic sign. In some MSS, the three Pes are followed by the first word or words of the Pericope being in larger letters. The editors of the first, second and third editions of the entire Hebrew Bible (Soncino, 1485; Naples, 1491—93; Brescia, 1494), have followed this practice. I have reverted to the more ancient practice which is exhibited in the best MSS, and in which 'Too is simply put in the margin against the commencement of the Pericope.

¹ Comp. Arundel Oriental 2 dated A. D. 1216; Add. 9401—2 dated A. D. 1286. This is also the case in the beauttful and most important MS. No. 13 in the Imperial and Royal Court Library at Vienna.

Chap. VI.

The Division into Verses.

IV. The fourth division of the text is into verses. The Scrolls of the Law, which undoubtedly exhibit the most ancient form of the Hebrew text, have as a rule no versicular division. These are found in all MSS. in book form with the vowel-points and the accents. The most cursory comparison of the Hebrew with the ancient versions discloses the fact that verses and whole groups of verses are found in the Septuagint which do not exist in the present Hebrew Bible, and that the Septuagint translation especially was made from a recension which in many respects differed materially from the present Massoretic recension.

When, therefore, the custodians of the Scriptures fixed the present text according to the MSS. which in their time were held as Standard Codices, they found it necessary not only to exclude these verses, but to guard against their inclusion on the part of Scribes. To secure this end the Massorites both carefully marked the last word of each verse by placing a stroke under it (7) called Silluk (7) and counted every such verse in each canonical book, in accordance with the traditions

¹ There are, however, some MS. Scrolls in which both the verse-division and the pause in the middle of the verse, are indicated by marks of a special kind evidently made to aid the prelector in the public reading of the hebdomadal lessons. Comp. Catalogue of the Hebrew MSS. in the University Library Cambridge by Schiller-Szinessey, p. 2 &c., Cambridge 1876.

which were preserved in the respective Schools. Hence the Talmud tells us that "the ancients were called Scribes [i. e. Sopherim or Counters] because they counted all the letters in Holy Writ. Thus they said that the Vav in [Levit. XI 42] is the middle letter in the Pentateuch, that דרש דרש ווא [Levit. X 16] is the middle word, that מיער ווא [Levit. XIII 33] is the middle verse; that the v in מיער ווא [Ps. LXXX 14] is the middle letter in the Psalter, and that Ps. LXXVII 38 is the middle verse". 1

In the division of the verses, however, as is the case with other features of the Hebrew text, the different Schools had different traditions. And though the verse-division, as finally fixed by the Massorites, is that which has been preserved and is followed in the MSS., yet traces of the Palestinian and other variations are occasionally given in different Codices and are indicated in the Massorah itself. Thus the word והתגלח = Levit. XIII 33 which the Talmud in the passage just quoted, gives as the middle verse of the Pentateuch, is not the one given in the Massoretic MSS. of the Bible, nor in the editions. The Massorah gives וישם עליו את Levit. VIII 8 as the middle verse, whilst Sopherim and the Palestinian Midrash give נישחש = Levit. VIII 23 as the middle verse. The same difference is exhibited with regard to the total number of verses in the Pentateuch, the Prophets and the Hagiographa, as will be seen from the following Table.

י לפיכך נקראו הראשונים סופרים שהיו סופרים כל האותיות שבתורה שהיו אומרים וא"ו דנחון חציין של אותיות של ספר תורה, דרש דרש חציין של תיבות, והתגלח של פסוקים, יכרסמנה חזיר מיער עי"ן דיער חציים של תהלים, והוא רחום יכפר עון Kiddushin 30a.

8064

[1765] _ total 23203 verses

[2527] ,

I. Pentateuch

II. The Prophets
III. The Hagiographa

Psalms

Chronicles

Introduction.		[3,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	
Sopherim and Yalkut	Babylon. Talmud	The Massorah	
15842 verses 1	5888 verses ² 5845 ve		
Levit. VIII 23	Levit XIII 3	Levit. VIII 8	
2204 verses		0204 verses	

5896 verses

5880

We moreover learn from the Talmud that the Palestinians had much shorter verses than the Babylonians, and that the former divided the single verse in Exod. XIX 9 into three distinct verses. The oldest Massorah extant informs us that whilst according to the *Maarbai* Deut. XVII 10 is the middle verse of Deuteronomy, according to the *Madinchai* the middle verse is Deut. XVII 12. The traces of these variations I have carefully indicated in the notes when I have found them in the MSS. since they not only exhibit a more ancient School, but explain some discrepancies in the numbers.

total 23100 verses

יושבון פסוקים של חומש ש"ו אלפים ותתמ"ב, ופסוקים של נבואים ב' אלפים ותע"ב, ופסוקים של נבואים ב' אלפים וח"ג, הכל ר"ג אלף קצט, לבד מספ' החצונים: נרצ"ד, ופסוקים של כתובים ה' אלפים וס"ג, הכל ר"ג אלף קצט, לבד מספ' החצונים: Comp. Yalkut on the Pentateuch No. 855. A very able article on this subject by Graetz is to be found in the Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums, vol. XXXIV, p. 97—102, Krotoshin 1885. ממונה חסר מורה ה' אלפים תחפח פסוקי ס' תורה יתר עליו תהילים שמונה חסר Kiddushin 30a; Nedarim 38a.

³ This addition does not include the Psalms and Chronicles which have been repeated here separately in order to exhibit the difference between the computation of the Talmud and the Massorah in these two books.

⁴ כי אתא ר' אחאבר אדא אמר במערבא פסקי להא' קרא תלתא פסוקי וואמר Comp. Kiddushin 30a; Nedarim 38a.

⁵ Comp. Oriental 4445, fol. 172b.

⁶ Comp. Gen. XXXV 22; Deut. XVI 3; XVII 10, 12; XXXII 35, 39;
Judg. VIII 29, 30; Isa. XX 2; Jerem. XXXIV 2; XXXVIII 28; Ps. XXII
5, 6; XXXIV 6; LII 1, 2; LIII 1, 2; XC 1; CXXIX 5, 6.

The Pentateuch. — Naturally the greatest care was taken in guarding the verse-division of the Pentateuch. Hence, not only is the sum-total of the verses in each book given, but the verses of each Pericope are counted and the number given at the end of each hebdomadal Lesson (acure) of the Annual Cycle with or without a mnemonic sign. It is, therefore, only natural to suppose that the Palestinians also must have exercised equal care and counted the verses in each Seder (acre) of their Triennial Cycle, and that in the neglect of the Sedarim the number of the Palestinian verses has perished.

As has already been remarked, the number of verses given at the and of each Parasha (TCTD) is followed by a mnemonic sign. This generally consists of a proper name, which is numerically of the same value. Here again we must notice that the different Schools had different Lists of these mnemonic signs from which each Scribe selected one or more to append to each Pericope. Hence it is that different MSS. vary in these signs, and that some Codices and the editio princeps of the Massoretic Bible by Jacob b. Chayim, have at times several of these mnemonic signs at the end of one and the same Parasha. These we shall now explain according to the order of the Parashas, as well as correct the mistakes which have crept into the printed editions and account for the discrepancies in the number of the verses.

The MSS. which I have collated for this branch of the text are as follows: (1) Orient. 4445 which is the oldest known at present. (2) Orient. 2201 dated A. D. 1246. (3) The splendid MS. marked No. 1 in the University Library at Madrid dated 1280. (4) Add. 9401—9402 dated 1286. (5) Orient. 1379. (6) Orient. 2348. (7) Orient. 2349. (8) Orient. 2350. (9) Orient. 2364. (10) Orient. 2365. (11) Orient. 2626. (12) Add 15251 and (13) the editio princeps of Jacob b. Chayim's Rabbinic Bible, Venice 1524—25.

- Genesis. (1) For בראשית (Gen. I_I-VI₈) which has 146 verses, all the MSS. with the exception of Add. 9401, give 146 as the mnemonic sign. The latter, however, has not only this name, but adds a second, viz. יחוקיהו which also exhibits the same numerical value. Hence the two names in the editio princeps. The connection between this MS. and the editio princeps, as far as the mnemonic signs are concerned, is also seen in Nos. 7, 10, 18, 30, 31, 39, 45 &c.
- (2) For הז (Gen. VI 9-XI 32) which has 153 verses, all the MSS. have בצלאל = 153. The editio princeps has not only this name, but adds to it the sentence אבי יסנה לום which is of the same numerical value, but which I could not find in the MSS.
- (3) For לך לך (XII $_{17}$ -XVII $_{27}$) which has $_{126}$ verses, all the MSS. have מכנדבי = $_{126}$. The editio princeps has $_{126}$ which I could not find in the MSS. and שמנדב which is a mistake for מכנדב.
- (4) In וירא (XVIII 1—XXII 24) we come to the first apparent discrepancy. The Massoretico-Grammatical Treatise which precedes the Yemen MSS. of the Pentateuch state, both in words and in numerals, that this Parasha has 146 verses and that the mnemonic sign is 146.1 Yet the same five MSS. in the text itself at the end of the Pericope state that it has 147 verses and give 147 as the mnemonic sign. The latter computation is also to be found in Orient. 2201, Orient. 2626 and Add. 15251 which give קוליא 147 as the mnemonic sign² as well as in Add. 9401, in MS. No. 1 in Madrid University Library which gives בונניהו 147 as the mnemonic sign

יומנין הפיסוקים מאה ששה וארבעים, קמו נגד המנין שם יחוקיה מאה מאה ומנין הפיסוקים מאה ששה וארבעים, קמו נגד המנין Or. 1379, fol. 22*a*; Or. 2348, fol. 26*a*; Or. 2349, fol. 16*a*; Or. 2350, fol. 24*a*, and Or. 2364, fol. 12*a*.

² In Oriental 2201 קוליה is a clerical error for אילי with א.

and the editio princeps which gives 147 as the mnemonic sign. There can, therefore, be no doubt that the two computations exhibit two different Massoretic Schools.

- (5) For איי שרה (Gen. XXIII 1-XXV 18) which has 105 verses, all the MSS. as well as the editio princeps give יהוידע = 105 as the mnemonic sign. It is, however, to be noticed that Add. 9401 has reversed both the numbers and signs in the preceding Pericope and in this, giving for the former קמו אמנון and for the latter קמו אמנון. This shows that the numbers and the mnemonic signs for the Pericopes were preserved in separate Lists and that the Scribes occasionally assigned them to the wrong place.
- (6) For חולדת (Gen. XXV 19—XXVIII 9) which has 106 verses, all the MSS. give יהללאל = 106 as the mnemonic sign. In the editio princeps both the number of verses and the sign are omitted altogether.
- (7) For איצו (Gen. XXVIII 10 XXXII 3) which has 148 verses, all the MSS. give חלקי = 148 as the mnemonic sign. Add. 9041, however, has the additional sign which is of the same numerical value. Hence the two signs, in the editio princeps.
- In (8) וישלח (Gen. XXXII 4—XXXVI 43) we have another apparent discrepancy. All the MSS., both in the separate Lists and at the end of this Pericope, distinctly declare that it has 154 verses. This is confirmed by the different mnemonic signs. Thus the five Yemen MSS. give קלימה = 154 as the mnemonic sign in the separate Treatise and in the text itself at the end of the Parasha they give | קנר פיסו׳ סימן אביאסף = 154. The former sign is also given in Or. 2201 and in the editio princeps. The Madrid Codex, which gives | ביר פיסו׳ שורים ביסו׳ שורים ביסו׳

י In Or. 2626 which has ק"נ קלימא there is evidently a clercial error due to the misspelling of the mnemonic sign.

same number. Yet there are only 153 verses in the *Parasha*, viz. 30 + 20 + 31 + 29 + 43 = 153. The discrepancy is due to the fact that XXXV 22 is two verses according to the to the fact that XXXV 22 is two verses according to the Parasha is according to the Eastern recension, whereas the number of the verses in the text is according to the Western recension. Hence also the double accents in this verse, one representing the Oriental and the other the Occidental verse-division.

- (9) For ישב (Gen. XXXVII 1—XL 23) which has 112 verses, all the MSS. give קָּלְי = 112 as the mnemonic sign, whereas the editio princeps has בָּלִי. Oriental 4445 which begins with Gen. XXXIX 20 also gives the number of verses after each Parasha, but not the mnemonic sign. As this is the oldest Hebrew MS. yet known, I shall henceforth include its numbers.
- (10) For מקץ (Gen. XLI I-XLIV 17) which has 146 verses, all the MSS., with the exception of Add. 9401, give יחוקיהו = 146 as the mnemonic sign. The latter gives = 146 as the sign. The editio princeps has no fewer than three separate signs, viz. אמציה, יהיה לי עבר the first is the one given in the majority of the MSS., the second is given in Add. 9401 and the third I could not find in any MS.
- (11) For וינים (Gen. XLIV 18—XLVII 27) which has 106 verses, all the MSS. and the editio princeps give 106 as the mnemonic sign. It will be seen that this sign is also given for the sixth Parasha which has the same number of verses.
- (12) For יחלי (Gen. XLVII 28—L 26) which has 85 verses, all the MSS., with the exception of one, give ימלה = 85 as the mnemonic sign. Or. 2626, however, gives מיכיה which is numerically of the same value. It is to be remarked that Or. 4445 gives של = 84 as the number of verses in this Parasha probably exhibiting a different recension.

All the MSS, agree that Genesis has 1534 verses and that the middle verse is Gen. XXVII 40.

Exodus. - (13) For שמות (Exod. I 1-VI 1) which has 124 verses, all the MSS. give מעדי 124 as the mnemomic sign. The editio princeps, which also gives this sign, has an additional one, viz. דיקח 124 which I could not find in the MSS.

- (14) For ארא (Exod. VI 2—IX 35) which has 121 verses, all the MSS. give יעיאל = 121 as the mnemonic sign. In the editio princeps, where the same sign is given, Jacob b. Chayim has also ביבעול = 121 which in this spelling does not occur in the Bible. The hapax legomenon in the Hebrew Scriptures is גבעל (Exod. IX 31) which is numerically 105. I could not, however, find this sign in any MS.
- - (16) For בשלח (Exod. XIII 17—XVII 16) which has 116 verses, all the MSS. give קנָאָה = 116 as the mnemonic sign. In the editio princeps, where this sign is also given, Jacob b. Chayim has added יד אמונה = 116 as another sign. This sign, however, I have not been able to find in any MS. The mnemonic sign קנואָה in Oriental 2365 is a clerical

blunder, since this name is numerically 122 and contradicts the statement by which it is preceded, viz. קיו פיסו׳ סנואה This error is probably due to the fact that the Scribe mistook it for the sign which belongs to Parasha ויקהל No. 22, where it is rightly given in all the MSS.

(17) In יתרו (Exod. XVIII 1-XX 26) we have another discrepancy. All the MSS. distinctly say that it has y = 072 verses and give אליאל = 72 as the mnemonic sign. The editio princeps, though giving another sign יונדב = 72 which I could not find in the MSS., gives the same number. Yet the number of verses in our editions is 75 (i. e. 27 + 25 + 23 = 75). Indeed the ordinary editions of the Hebrew Bible have 26 verses in chap. XX, since verse 13 is divided into four verses. The apparent discrepancy is due to the different ways of dividing chap. XX into verses which obtained in olden days, one designed for public reading and the other in accordance with the division of the sentences. For public reading, when the Chaldee version was recited by the official interpreter after every verse, the Decalogue was divided into ten verses, so as to assign a separate verse to each commandment. Hence with the one introductory verse and the nine verses after the Decalogue, this chapter according to the Massorah and the MSS. has only twenty verses (i. e. 1 + 10 + 9 = 20). According to the sense, however, the Decalogue is divided into 12 verses which with the one preliminary verse and the nine following verses, give to chap. XX twenty-two verses (viz. 1 + 12 + 9 = 22), and Parasha יחרו has 74 verses. The double accents exhibit the two different verse-divisions. The computation here is in accordance with the former practice, whereas the sum-total at the end of Exodus is in accordance with the latter practice.

(18) For משפטים (Exod. XXI 1—XXIV 18) which has 118 verses, all the MSS., with the exception of one,

give אויאל = 118 as the mnemonic sign. It is only Add. 9401 which gives דוני = 118 as the sign. Hence the two signs אווי and דוני and דוני in the editio princeps.

- (Exod. XXV I—XXVII 19) which has 96 verses, all the MSS., with the exception of Add. 15251, give סלו = 96 as the mnemonic sign. The spelling with w in Oriental 2201 is a clerical error. The edition princeps which also gives this sign has the additional sign = 96 which is manifestly taken from this Parasha (Exod. XXVII 3), but which I could not find in the MSS.
- (20) For תצוה (Exod. XXVII 20—XXX 10) which has 101 verses, all the MSS. and the editio princeps give the mnemonic sign מיכאל = 101.
- (21) For כי תשא (Exod. XXX 11—XXXIV 35) which has 139 verses, all the MSS. and the editio princeps give בונאל = 139 as the mnemonic sign.
- (22) For ייקהל (Exod. XXXV 1—XXXVIII 20) which has 122 verses, all the MSS. and the editio princeps give מנואה = 122 as the mnemonic sign. This is the name which is given by mistake for Parasha בשלח No. 16 in Oriental 2365.
- (23) For פקודי (Exod. XXXVIII 21-XL 38) which has 92 verses, eight MSS. out of the ten give 192 as the mnemonic sign. The absence of the number of verses and the sign at the end of this *Parasha* in Add. 9401 and in Or. 2626, is due to the ornament which occupies the space between the two books. Hence their absence in the *editio princeps*, the editor of which had manifestly before him MSS. with ornamental letters at the beginning of Leviticus which excluded the signs at the end of Exodus.

י אומם which the Madrid Codex gives is manifestly a clerical error since this MS. distinctly states that this Parasha has (יצ יוֹם יוֹנִי 196) 96 verses.

All the MSS, and the editio princeps state at the end of this book that Exodus has 1209 verses and that the middle verse is XXII 27. This computation is in accordance with the practice of dividing the Decalogue into twelve and chap. XX into 22 verses. In accordance with the practice which divided the Decalogue into ten verses and chap. XX into 20 verses the sum-total is 1207. For this two-fold division we must refer to the remark on Parasha 170. No. 17.

Leviticus. — (24) ויקרא (Levit. I 1-V 26) which has 111 verses, all the MSS. give דעואל = 111 as the mnemonic sign. The same sign is given below in Parasha No. 46 which has also 111 verses. The sign אין = 96 in the editio princeps has manifestly been inserted here from the next Parasha by an oversight on the part of Jacob b. Chayim.

- (25) For או (Levit. VI 1—VIII 36) which has 97 verses, all the MSS., except one, give עבדיהו = 97. Oriental 2626, however, states that this Parasha has או = 96 verses and gives 96 as the mnemonic sign. But this is evidently due to the scribe who confused the name of the Parasha (או) with the memonical sign. Having taken או as the number, he was obliged to invent the mnemonical sign who dropped the mnemonic sign, erroneously retained או 96 to express the numerical value.
- (26) For שמיני (Levit. IX 1—XI 47) which has 91 verses, all the MSS., with the exception of one, give מיכוהו = 91 as the mnemonic sign. Add. 9401, however, gives שברא = 91 as the mnemonic sign which is also given by Jacob b. Chayim. The connection between the *editio princeps* and this MS. has already been pointed out in *Parashas* Nos. 1, 7, 10, 18, 30, 39, 45 &c.
- (27) For תוריע (Levit. XII 1—XIII 5) which has 67 verses, all the MSS, and the *editio princeps* give בניה = 67 as the mnemonic sign.

- עפרי (28) For מצרע (Levit. XIV 1-XV 33) which has 90 verses, all the MSS. give יעדו 90 as the mnemonic sign. is the *Keri* in 2 Chron. IX 29 the only place where this name occurs, whereas the *Kethiv* is יְעָדִי 94. It will thus be seen that the official *Keri* is the only textual reading recognised by the Massorites even in mnemonic signs. which is given in the *editio princeps*, though numerically correct, does not occur in the Hebrew Scriptures, nor is it given in any MS. as the sign. It is most probably due to an erroneous transposition of the first two letters on the part of the Scribe.
- (29) For אחרי מות (Levit. XVI I—XVIII 30) which has 80 verses, all the MSS. give קודי 80 as the mnemonic sign. The *editio princeps* which also gives this sign, gives בי כָּל = 80 as a first sign, which I could not find in the MSS.
- (30) For קרשים (Levit. XIX 1—XX 27) which has 64 verses six of the MSS., viz. Orient. 1379, Or. 2348, Or. 2349, Or. 2350, Or. 2364 and Or. 2365 give קרו = 64 as the mnemonic sign, three MSS., viz. Orient. 2201, Orient. 2626 and Add. 15251 give אוֹנוֹ = 64 as the sign, one MSS., viz. Add. 9401 gives the name אוֹנוֹ = 64 as the sign, and the sign, the Madrid Codex gives אוֹנוֹ = 64 as the sign, and the editio princeps gives two signs אוֹנוֹ = 64 and אוֹנוֹ = 64. The first I could not find in the MSS. and the second is to be found in Add. 9041. The connection between the mnemonic signs in the editio princeps and Add. 9401 has already been pointed out in Parasha No. 1. Here again we have a striking evidence that there were separate Lists of these signs, and that each Scribe chose the one which best commended itself to his taste.
 - (31) For אמר (Levit. XXI 1—XXIV 23) which has 124 verses, all the MSS. with the exception of Add. 9401, give מַעָּרִי = 124 as the mnemonic sign. This MS., however, gives אלעווי as the sign. Hence also the *editio princeps*.

- (32) For בהר (Levit. XXV 1—XXVI 2) which has 57 verses, all the MSS as well as the editio princeps give בהר = 57 as the mnemonic sign. Jacob b. Chayim also gives בּיִבְּאָרְאָיִר = 57 as a second sign, which, however, I could not find in the MSS, nor does this plene form occur in the Bible.
- (33) For בחקתי (Levit. XXVI 3—XXVII 34) which has 78 verses, all the MSS. and the editio princeps give 78 as the mnemonic sign. The spelling און in the editio princeps is a clerical error, since this is numerically 82 and is evidently due to the substitution of ה for x on the part of the Scribe.

The sum-total of the verses in Leviticus accordingly is 859, and the middle verse is XV 7. This entirely agrees with the statement in the Massoretic Summary given in the MSS, at the end of this book.

Numbers. -- (34) For במדבר (Numb. T 1—IV 20) which has 159 verses, all the MSS. and the editio princeps give הלְלָהָה which is given in Orient. 2201 and Orient. 2349 is due to a clerical error, since it is numerically 153 and contradicts the right number by which it is preceded in these very MSS.

- (35) For אשא (Numb. IV 21—VII 89) which has 176 verses, all the MSS. give שְּמֵּוֹם 176 as the mnemonic sign. The editio princeps which also gives it adds שְמִינְדָב 176 as a second sign. This sign I could not find in the MSS. and it has evidently been selected because it occurs in this Parasha.
- (36) For בהעלתך (Number VIII 1—XII 16) which has 130 verses, all the MSS. and the editio princeps give בהעלמל 136 as the mnemonic sign. It is to be remarked that Oriental 4445 gives the number of verses in this Parasha as הלה ביז being one verse less. This probably exhibits a variation in the verse-divisions which obtained in another School.

- (37) For שלח לך (Numb. XIII i-XV 41) which has verses, all the MSS. and the *editio princeps* give g = 119 as the mnemonic sign. This sign also occurs in *Parasha* No. 45.
- (38) For קרח (Numb. XVI τ -XVIII (Numb. 32) which has 95 verses, all the MSS. and the editio princeps give $\tau = 95$ as the mnemonic sign. און $\tau = 98$ by which the sign is preceded in the editio princeps is manifestly a mistake for $\tau = 95$
- (39) For הקה (Numb. XIX I—XXII I) which has 87 verses, all the MSS., except Add. 9401, give אין = 87 as the mnemonic sign. This MS., however, gives יְמֵיּאֵל = 87 as the sign. Hence the second sign in the editio princeps. Jacob b. Chayim has also as first sign אַבְיִרָּבָּא = 87 which I could not find in the MSS., but which is evidently chosen because it occurs in the Parasha. The only sign which is given in the nine MSS., occupies in the editio princeps the third position.
- (40) For בלק (Numb. XXII z-XXV 9) which has 104 verses, all the MSS. and the editio princeps give בנות = 104 as the mnemonic sign.
- (41) For פֿינוס (Numb. XXV 10-XXX 1) which has 168 verses, the different MSS. give three separate mnemonic signs. Thus Add. 9401, Or. 2626, the Madrid Codex and the editio princeps give אָלִיפְלָּהוּ = 168; Or. 2201 and Add. 15251 give קַּמֶּלִיקְּלָּהְ = 168 which is also given in the editio princeps as the first of the two signs, and is evidently selected because it occurs in this Parasha; whilst Oriental 1379, Oriental 2348, Oriental 2349, Oriental 2350, Oriental 2364 and Oriental 2365 give פַּמְלְהִים = 168. Here again we have evidence of the existence of separate Lists of these mnemonic signs from which the different Scribes chose according to their liking.
- (42) For מטוח (Numb. XXX 2—XXXII 42) which has 112 verses, all the MSS. with exception of Add. 15251 and the Madrid Codex give ביבל = 112 as the mnemonic sign.

These MSS., however, give בָּקְי = 112 as the sign. Jacob b. Chayim not only gives both these signs, but has a third, viz. which occupies the middle position, and which I could not find in the MSS. The first sign נקי is manifestly a misprint in the editio princeps.

(43) For מסעי (Numb. XXXIII ו –XXXVI (13) which has 132 verses, all the MSS. give בְּלֶּק = 132 as the mnemonic sign. Jacob b. Chayim not only omits this sign, but gives two signs, viz. אוֹלָה = 83 and אוֹלָה = 49 which together yield 132 and which I could not find in the MSS. The first was evidently selected because it occurs in this Parasha, and the second has been added to it to yield the requisite number.

In casting up the number of verses in the separate Parashas of Numbers it will be seen that this book contains altogether 1288 verses, and that the middle verse is XVII 20. This entirely agrees with the number given in the Massoretic Summary at the end of Numbers. The only exception is Oriental 4445 which states at the end of the book¹ that it contains 1285 verses. But as the numbers given at the end of each Parasha in this very MS. agree, with one exception, with those given in the other MSS. it is evident that the Scribe committed an error in the summing up. The only difference, as we have seen, is in Parasha אונה אונה אונה בהעלתך No. 36 which according to Oriental 4445 has 135 verses instead of 136 given in all the other MSS.

Deuteronomy. — (44) For דברים (Deut. I 1—III 22) which has 105 verses, all the MSS. and the *editio princeps* give מַלְבָּיָה = 105 as the mnemonic sign.

(45) For ואחתון (Deut. III 23—VII 11) which has 119 verses, all the MSS. with the exception of Add. 9401, give בּלָּטֵּ = 119 as the mnemonic sign. It is the same sign which is given for *Parasha* No. 37 for the same number of verses. It is Add. 9401 which gives the mnemonic sign ** = 118.

Hence, this sign in the editio princeps which gives the number of verses in this Parasha as קיח = 118. It will be seen that according to the statement in all the MSS. this Parasha has 119 verses, whilst according to the common division of the verses it has 122 verses. The difference is due to the different ways in which the Decalogue was divided in chapter V. And as this question has already been discussed, we must refer to Parasha יחרו No. 17.

- (46) For אקב (Deut. VII 12—XI 25) which has 111 verses, the different MSS. give three different mnemonic signs. Thus, Oriental 2201, Add. 9401, Add. 15251 as well as the editio princeps give יְעָלָא 111; Oriental 1379, Or. 2348, Or. 2349, Or. 2350, Or. 2364 and Or. 2365 give אָרָי = 111; and Or. 2626 gives פֿלאי = 111 which is the Kethiv in Judg. XIII 18. The additional איך in the editio princeps is simply a transposition of איך and is misleading, since there is no such word in the Hebrew Scriptures.
- (48) For שפטים (Deut. XVI 18—XXI 9) which has 97 verses, the MSS. give two different mnemonic signs. Oriental 2201, Add. 9401, Add. 15251 and Or. 2626 as well as the editio princeps give קלוא = 97 as the sign, whilst Or. 2348, Or. 2349, Or. 2350, Or. 2364 and Or. 2365 give שבריה = 97 as the sign. The sign שבריה in Or. 1379 is a clerical error.

Introduction.

- (49) For כי תצא (Deut. XXI 10-XXV 19) which has 110 verses, all the MSS. and the editio princeps give שלי as the mnemonic sign.
- (50) For בי תבוא (Deut. XXVI I—XXIX 8) which has 122 verses, all the MSS., except one, give מָבְבָּי = 122 as the mnemonic sign. מכנבי in Or. 2349 is a clerical error, due to a transposition of the middle letters, since such a name does not occur. The sign מְעַבְּדִין = 122 given in the editio princeps I could not find in the MSS.
- (51) For נצבים (Deut. XXIX 9—XXX 20) which has 40 verses, Or. 2626 gives the mnemonic sign אוֹרָיָה = 40, which does not occur in the Hebrew Bible, whilst the editio princeps gives לְבָבוֹ = 40 as the sign. All the other MSS. count this and the following Parashas together.
- (52) For אדניה (Deut. XXXI 1—30) which has 30 verses, Or. 2626 gives יהוּדָה = 30 as the mnemonic sign. The remark in the editio princeps, i. e. that "this Parasha has 70 verses and that the sign is אדניה סיט", is misleading, since this sign belongs to the two Parashas counted together, as all the MSS. have it, with the exception of Or. 2626. As Jacob b. Chayim has already given the number of verses for the preceding Parasha by itself, there are only 30 verses left for this Parasha. Hence, this number, and the mnemonic sign which he gives here, are incorrect. Orient. 2626 which, as we have seen, counts these Parashas separately with separate signs, remarks at the end of the second Parasha אדניה אדניה i. e. the verses of the two Parashas together are 70 and the sign is אדניה = 70.
- (53) For האוינו (Deut. XXXII 1-52) which has 52 verses, all the MSS. except one give בָּלֶב =52 as the mnemonic sign. In Add. 9401 both the number of verses and the sign are omitted. Hence, they are also omitted in the editio princeps.

(54) For ווֹאת הברכה (Deut. XXXIII ב-XXXIV 12) which has 44 verses, all the MSS. as well as the editio princeps give פּאָראָל = 41 as the mnemonic sign. Jacob b. Chayim gives also אָלי = 41 as a second sign which I could not find in the MSS.

Accordingly the sum-total of the verses in Deuteronomy is 955; and the middle verse is Deut. XVII 10. This agrees with the statement in the Massoretic Summary given in the MSS. at the end of Deuteronomy.

In accordance with the same MSS, the sum-total of the verses in the entire Pentateuch is 5845 or 5843 and the middle verses is Levit. VIII 8. The difference of the two verses as we have seen, is due to the two-fold manner in which the Decalogue is divided in Exodus XX and Deut, V.

Before proceeding to discuss the verses in the Prophets and in the Hagiographa I must give here the following Table of the verses &c. which has been preserved in the Yemen MSS. of the Pentateuch, and which professes to be a copy from the celebrated Ben Asher Codex: —

"The Law of the Lord is perfect, converting the Soul" [Ps. XIX 7].

The number of verses in Genesis is

The number of verses in Exodus is

The number of verses in Leviticus is

The number of verses in Numbers is

The number of verses in Deuteronomy is

תוֹרת וְהוָה הְמִימָה מְשִׁיבַת נָפֶשׁ

סכום הפיסוקים של ספר בראשית אלף וחמש מאות ושלשים וארבעה סימן אֹךְ לֹדׁ סכום הפיסוקים של ספר ואלה שמות אלף ומאתים ותשעה פיסיקים סימן אֹרֹמׁ סכום הפיסוקים של ספר ויקרא שמונה מאות וחמשים ותשעה סימן נְמֹׁלְ סכום הפיסוקים של ספר במדבר סיני אלף ומאתים ושמונים ושמונה סימן אֹרֹפֹּחׁ סכום הפיסוקים של ספר אלה הדברים תשע מאות וחמשים וחמשה סימן הֹנֹץׁ And observe that from Gen. I I to XXXIV 19 is 1000 verses.

From Exod. XVII 16 to Levit. XI 8 is 1000 verses.

From Levit, XI 8 to Numb. X 16 is 1000 verses.

From Numb. X 17 to Deut. III 29 is 1000 verses.

And from Deut. IV 1 to XXXIV 12 is 845 verses.

The number of verses in the whole Pentateuch is 5845, the sign is בוֹך מֹה = 5845. The number of the large Parashas in the Pentateuch is 53, the sign is אליהיא = 53. The number of the Scdarim in the Pentateuch is 154, the sign is = 53.

The middle verse of Genesis is XXVIII 4.

The middle verse of Exodus is XXII 27.

The middle verse of Leviticus is XV 7.

The middle verse of Numbers is XVII 20.

The middle verse of Deuteronomy is XVII 10.

The middle verse of the entire Pentateuch is Levit. VIII 7.

The middle word of the Pentateuch is Levit. X 16, דְרשׁ belongs to the first half and דֵרשׁ to the second.

The middle letter of the Pentateuch is the Vav in The Levit, XI 42.

י מבשרם לא האבלו occurs both in Levit. XI 8 and verse II. It is, therefore, difficult to say whether the reference is to the first or the second.

ודע מן בראשות ער וובא חמור אלך פוסוקום.

ומן ויבא חמור עד כי יד על כם יה אלף פיסוקים.

ומן כי יד עד מבשרם לא תאכלו אלף פיסוקים. ומן מבשרם עד והירד המשכן אלף פיסוקים.

ומן והורד עד ועתה ישראל שמע אלף פיסוקים.

ומן ועתה ישראל שמע עד סוף התורה שמונה מאית ארבעים וחמשה פיסיקים. סבים הפיסוקים של כל התורה חמש אלפים ושמונה מאית וארבעים וחמשה סימן הֹךְ בֹּהֹ ומנין הפרשיות הגדולות של תורה שלשה וחמשים פרשיות נגד המנין שם אליהוא ומנין סדרים של תורה מאה וחמשים וארבעה נגד המנין שם קליטה

הצי ספר בראשית ועל חרבך תחיה.

חצי ספר ואלה שמות אלהים לא תקלל.

חצי ספר ויקרא והנוגע כבשר חזב.

חצי ספר וודבר והוה האיש אשר אבחר בו.

חצי ספר אלה הדברים ועשית על פי הדבר.

חצי התורה כולה בפיסוקים וישם עליו את החשן.

חצי התורה בתיבות דרש דרש משה, דרש מזה ודרש מזה. חצי התורה באותיות זו דגחון.

י Or. 2350 adds סימן המולף ולמערבאי יתיר.

The correct number of words in the Pentateuch is 79856, the sign is

The correct number of letters in the Pentateuch is 409000, the sign is $\dot{\gamma}\dot{n} = 409000$.

The number of Closed Sections in the Pentateuch is 290.

And of Open Sections 379.

Altogether the Sections are 669.

All this is according to the model Codex which was in Egypt and which was revised by Ben Asher wo studied it many years when correcting it.1

It will thus be seen that the Babylonian *Parashas* or Annual Pericopes are treated in the MSS. as chapters for the purpose of numbering the verses.

The Prophets and the Hagiographa. — With regard to the Prophets and Hagiographa no sectional divisions in any book have been utilized for the purpose of counting the number of verses in them. The MSS, simply state in the margin of the text against the verse in question that it is the middle verse of the book, and at the end of each book the MSS, give a Summary saying that it contains so many verses &c. &c. Hence, discrepancies or variations in the sum-total of the verses given in the Massoretic Summaries at the end of a book cannot easily be traced to the precise section which is affected by the divergent statement in

מספר תיבות של תורה על אמיתתם תשעה ושבעים אלף ושמונה מאות וששה וחמשים מימן מֹעֹתֹתֹנוֹ

ומספר האותיות של תורה באמת ארבע מאות אלף ותשע מאות מימן תׁיֹּץ ומנין הפרשיות הפתוחות של כל התורה מאתים ותשעים, והסתומות שלש מאות תשעה זשבעים.

> הכל שש מאות ששים ותשעה פרשיות. הכל על תיקון הספר שהיה במצרים שהגיהו. בן אשר ודקדק בו שנים רבות כמו שהעתיקו.

¹ This Summary is appended to Oriental 2349, fol. 144a; Orient. 2350, fol. 304b; Orient. 2364, fol. 184b; Orient. 2365, fol. 202b and Orient. 1379, fol. 373b.

the MSS. Instances of this difficulty will be seen in the following analysis of each book.

Joshua. — All the MSS. state that Joshua has 656 verses 1 and that XIII 25 is the middle verse. This is perfectly correct without the two verses in the text which are in the margin in modern editions, as will be seen from the following analysis of the number of verses in each of the twenty-four chapters in this book: (I) 18 + (II) 24 + (III) 17 + (IV) 24 + (V) 15 + (VI) 27 + (VII) 26 + (VIII) 35 +(IX) 27 + (X) 43 + (XI) 23 + (XII) 24 + (XIII) 25 + 82 + (XIV) 15 + (XV) 63 + (XVI) 10 + (XVII) 18 +(XVIII) 28 + (XIX) 51 + (XX) 9 + (XXI) 43 + (XXII) 34 + (XXIII) $_{16}$ + (XXIV) $_{33}$ = 656. But the difficulty is that those MSS. which have the two verses in the text also give the sum-total as 656, and XIII 25 as the middle verse. We must, therefore, conclude that the Massoretic Summary at the end of the book has been taken from Lists which belonged to a School that excluded these verses from the text.

¹ Thus the St. Petersburg Codex, at the end of the Prophets (fol. 224*a*) which gives a list of the verses, says יהושע שש מאות וחמשים וששה פסוקים.

² Whereever two enumerations of verses are given (as in this case) under one chapter, it denotes the division of the book; the first number of verses belongs to the first half of the book, and the second number, belongs to the second half.

³ Thus the St. Petersburg Codex, fol. 224 a ששמי ששמי ששמי שש מאות ושמנה

11 + (XI) 40 + (XII) 15 + (XIII) 25 + (XIV) 20 + (XV) 20 + (XVI) 31 + (XVII) 13 + (XVIII) 31 + (XIX) 30 + (XX) 48 + (XXI) 25 = 618. This computation, however, is in accordance with the Western School; the Easterns read VIII 29 and 30 as one verse.

Samuel. — With regard to the total number of verses in Samuel all the MSS., except two, state that this book has 1506 verses, which agrees with the number of the verses affixed to the chapters in the modern editions, as will be seen from the following analysis: (I) 28 + (II) 36 + (III) 21 + (IV) 22 + (V)12 + (VI) 21 + (VII) 17 + (VIII) 22 + (IX) 27 + (X) 27 +(XI) 15 + (XII) 25 + (XIII) 23 + (XIV) 52 + (XV) 35 + (XVI) 23 + (XVII) 58 + (XVIII) 30 + (XIX) 24 + (XX)42 + (XXI) 16 + (XXII) 23 + (XXIII) 29 + (XXIV) 22 +(XXV) 44 + (XXVI) 25 + (XXVII) 12 + (XXVIII) 23 + 2 + (XXIX) 11 + (XXX) 31 + (XXXI) 13 + (2 Sam. I.) 27 +(II) 32 + (III) 39 + (IV) 12 + (V) 25 + (VI) 23 + (VII) 29+ (VIII) 18 + (IX) 13 + (X) 19 + (XI) 27 + (XII) 31 +(XIII) 39 + (XIV) 33 + (XV) 37 + (XVI) 23 + (XVII) 29 + (XVIII) 32 + (XIX) 44 + (XX) 26 + (XXI) 22 + (XXII) 51 + (XXIII) 39 + (XXIV) 25 = 1506.

The St. Petersburg Codex and Arund. Orient. 16, however, state that it has 1504. The latter also gives the mnemonic sign to the same effect. If this is correct these MSS. must exhibit a School in which some of the verses were differently divided.

The real difficulty arises from the fact that Or. 2201, Arundel Or. 16, Harley 5710—11, Add. 15251 &c. state in the Summary that 1 Sam. XXVIII 23 is the middle verse and remark in the margin of the text against this verse

¹ Thus the St. Petersburg Codex שמיאל אלף וחמש מאות וארבעה שמיאל אלף וחמש מחות וארבעה. In Arund. Or. 16, fol. 74b, it is מאות וארבע מאות אלף שמאל אלף שמאל אלף סימן.

שלשים וחמשה.

"the middle of the book". This is followed by all the early and modern editions which record the Massoretic divisions. But on examination of the verses in the respective chapters, as given above, it will be seen that if we take ולאשה עגל מרבק = XXVIII 24 to begin the second half of the book, it leaves 754 verses for the first half and the second half has only 752 verses. The difficulty, however, is removed by the Massoretic Summary in Harley 5720. This MS, which is one of the oldest known at present, not only states at the end of the book that the second half begins with XXVIII 23,1 but has in the margin of the text against this verse, that "the half is here". Hence, if the other MSS. and the editions are taken to represent a different School they do not harmonise with the present numbering of the verses. For the sake of harmony we must adopt the Massoretic note as given in Harley 5720.

Kings. — All the MSS. distinctly state that this book has $_{1534}$ verses, and that I Kings XXII 6 begins the second half.² But from the following analysis it will be seen that it has $_{1536}$ verses and that the middle shows that each half contains 768 verses, thus yielding two verses more then the Massoretic summary gives: (I) $_{53}$ + (II) $_{46}$ + (III) $_{28}$ + (IV) $_{20}$ + (V) $_{32}$ + (VI) $_{38}$ + (VII) $_{51}$ + (VIII) $_{66}$ + (IX) $_{28}$ + (X) $_{29}$ + (XI) $_{43}$ + (XII) $_{33}$ + (XIII) $_{34}$ + (XIV) $_{31}$ + (XV) $_{34}$ + (XVI) $_{34}$ + (XVII) $_{24}$ + (XVIII) $_{46}$ + (XIX) $_{21}$ + (XX) $_{43}$ + (XXI) $_{29}$ + (XXII) $_{5}$ + $_{49}$ + (2 Kings I) $_{18}$ + (II) $_{25}$ + (III) $_{27}$ + (IV) $_{44}$ + (V) $_{27}$ + (VI) $_{33}$ + (VII) $_{20}$ + (VIII) $_{29}$ + (IX) $_{37}$ + (X) $_{36}$ + (XI) $_{20}$ + (XIII) $_{22}$ + (XIII) $_{25}$ + (XIV) $_{29}$ + (XV) $_{38}$ + (XVI)

י Fol. וובחצי וימאן ויאמר Fol. והחצי וימאן ויאמר.

ים מון החופרא אלף וחמש מאות ושלשים וארבער, דלאך סימן, וחציו 2 ויקבץ מלך ישראל.

 $_{20}$ + (XVII) $_{41}$ + (XVIII) $_{37}$ + (XIX) $_{37}$ + (XX) $_{21}$ + (XXI) $_{26}$ + (XXII) $_{20}$ + (XXIII) $_{37}$ + (XXIV) $_{20}$ + (XXV) $_{30}$ = $_{1536}$. The difference of the two verses between the Massoretic Summary and the sum-total according to the number of verses in each chapter I have been unable to trace.

Isaiah. — The Babylonian Codex, which is the oldest dated MS. of the Former Prophets, gives the number of verses in this Book as 1272.1 Harley 5720, however, which comes next in age of this portion of the Hebrew Scriptures, states at the end of Isaiah that it has 1291 verses;2 and that XXXIII 21 begins the second half of the book This is confirmed by Or. 2211, Arund. Or. 16, Add. 15251 and other MSS., which not only give the number in words, but exhibit it in the mnemonic sign. This fully agrees with the sum-total of the number of verses in each chapter, as will be seen from the following analysis: (I) 31 + (II) 22 + (III) $_{26}$ + (IV) $_{6}$ + (V) $_{30}$ + (VI) $_{13}$ + (VII) $_{25}$ + (VIII) $_{23}$ + (IX) 20 + (X) 34 + (XI) 16 + (XII) 6 + (XIII) 22 + $(XIV)_{32} + (XV)_{9} + (XVI)_{14} + (XVII)_{14} + (XVIII)_{7} +$ (XIX) 25 + (XX) 6 + (XXI) 17 + (XXII) 25 + (XXIII)18 + (XXIV) 23 + (XXV) 12 + (XXVI) 21 + (XXVII) 13 +(XXVIII) 29 + (XXIX) 24 + (XXX) 33 + (XXXI) 9 + (XXXII) 20 + (XXXIII) 20 + 4 + (XXXIV) 17 + (XXXV)10 + (XXXVI) 22 + (XXXVII) 38 + (XXXVIII) 22 + (XXXIX) 8 + (XL) 31 + (XLI) 29 + (XLII) 25 + (XLIII)28 + (XLIV) 28 + (XLV) 25 + (XLVI) 13 + (XLVII) 15 +(XLVIII) 22 + (XLIX) 26 + (L) 11 + (LI) 23 + (LII) 15 + (LIII) 12 + (LIV) 17 + (LV) 13 + (LVI) 12 + (LVII) 21 + (LVIII) 14 + (LIX) 21 + (LX) 22 + (LXI) 11 + (LXII) 12 + (LXIII) 19 + (LXIV) 11 + (LXV) 25 + (LXVI) 24= 1201.

¹ The St. Petersburg Codex ישעיה אלף ומאחים ושבעים ושני.

 $^{^2}$ Fol. $225\,a$ with $200\,b$ המון ותשעים ומאתים אלף מפר של סכום הפסוקים של מפר ימימני ארצא.

Oriental 2201, however, which is dated A. D. 1246 states as distinctly that Isaiah has 1295 verses and gives the mnemonic sign to this effect. This is followed in the Rabbinic Bible edited by Felix Pratenses, Bomberg 1517, by Jacob b. Chayim 1524-5 and in all the modern editions which give the Massoretic Summary, except by Dr. Baer. As both the MSS, and editions which give this number agree that XXXIII 21 begins the second half of the book, they must exhibit a School which divided some of the verses differently, so as to obtain four more verses than the majority of the MSS, give.

Dr. Baer's statement that this book has 1292 verses is against both the MSS., and the editions. The mnemonic sign which he gives to support this number is his own invention. How the first, second and third editions of the Bible came to mark in the text XXXVI I as the second half of the book I have not been able to trace.

Jercmiah. — The total number of verses in this book, viz. 1365, which I have given in the first part of the Summary, is in accordance with the statement in most of the MSS. which give it both in words and in the mnemonic sign.² This is the number given in Harley 5720; Harley 1528; Oriental 2201 and Add. 15251 and this is also the number given by Jacob b. Chayim in the first edition of his Rabbinic Bible. The Babylonian Codex, however, gives 1364 as the number ³ which I have given in the Summary as a variation. The latter agrees with the sumtotal obtained from a computation of the verses in our chapters, as will be seen from the following analysis: (I) 19 +

וחציו ארצה, וחשעים וחמש, וסימן ארצה, וחציו בסוק ספר ישעיה אלף ומאתים ותשעים וחמש, וסימן ארצה, וחציו ייי דיר ייי דיר אם שם אדיר ייי

² סכום הפסוקים של ספר אלף ושלש מאות וששים והמשה וסימני אשסה.

³ This number התתקםר is more fully given in the St. Petersburg Codex at the end where it is stated as follows: ירמהו אלף ושלש מאות וששים וארבעה.

(II) 37 + (III) 25 + (IV) 31 + (V) 31 + (VI) 30 + (VII) 34 + (VIII) 23 + (IX) 25 + (X) 25 + (XI) 23 + (XII) 17 + (XIII) 27 + (XIV) 22 + (XV) 21 + (XVI) 21 + (XVII) 27 + (XVIII) 23 + (XIX) 15 + (XX) 18 + (XXI) 14 + (XXII) 30 + (XXIII) 40 + (XXIV) 10 + (XXV) 38 + (XXVI) 24 + (XXVII) 22 + (XXVIII) 10 + 7 + (XXIX) 32 + (XXXI) 24 + (XXXI) 40 + (XXXII) 44 + (XXXIII) 26 + (XXXIV) 22 + (XXXV) 19 + (XXXVI) 32 + (XXXVII) 21 + (XXXVIII) 28 + (XXXIX) 18 + (XL) 16 + (XLI) 18 + (XLII) 22 + (XLIII) 13 + (XLIV) 30 + (XLV) 5 + (XLVI) 28 + (XLVII) 7 + (XLVIII) 47 + (XLIX) 39 + (L) 46 + (LI) 64 + (LII) 34 = 1364.

It is remarkable that the Babylonian Codex which is supposed to exhibit the Eastern recension, should have one verse less than the Western MSS., inasmuch as according to the Orientals, XXXIV 2 and XXXVIII 28 are respectively divided into two verses, thus yielding a total of 1367 verses. But this is one of the many facts which show how precarious it is to adduce the St. Petersburg Codex by itself in support of an Eastern reading. Here again we have the inexplicable fact that the *editio princeps* of the Prophets (Naples 1486—7); the first edition of the entire Hebrew Bible (Soncino 1488); and the second edition (Naples 1491—3) introduce into the text The half before XXVI 1, thus marking it as beginning the second half of Jeremiah.

Ezckiel. — Not only the St. Petersburg Codex, but Or. 2201; Arundel Or. 16; Add. 15252 and Oriental 2627 distinctly say that this book has 1273 verses. This number is also given by Felix Pratensis and Jacob b. Chayim. Harley 5710-11, however, as distinctly declares that it

¹ At the end of the Prophets the St. Petersburg Codex, however, gives it as 1270 אלך לקלע מילד.

has 1274 verses. This statement is all the more remarkable since XL 8, which is wanting in the Septuagint, the Syriac and Vulgate is also wanting in this MS. Two verses must, therefore, have been obtained in this Codex by a different verse division. Still more remarkable is the fact that all these MSS., including the St. Petersburg Codex and Harley 5710—11, give Ezek. XXVI I as beginning the second half of Ezekiel. Both the St. Petersburg and the Harley MSS. also mark in the margin of the text against XXIV 24 that it is the middle of the book. Again, in the first, second and third editions of the Hebrew text Ezekiel XXV 15 is marked in the text as half of the book. These variations undoubtedly preserve a difference in the verse division which obtained in the different Massoretic Schools, but which I have not been able to trace.

According to the current verse-divisions which are supported by most MSS. and which I have followed, Ezekiel has 1273 verses, and XXVI I is marked as beginning the second half. This will be seen from the following analysis: (I) 28 + (II) 10 + (III) 27 + (IV) 17 + (V) 17 + (VI) 14 + (VII) 27 + (VIII) 18 + (IX) 11 + (X) 22 + (XI) 25 + (XII) 28 + (XIII) 23 + (XIV) 23 + (XV) 8 + (XVI) 63 + (XVII) 24 + (XVIII) 32 + (XIX) 14 + (XX) 44 +(XXI) 37 + (XXII) 31 + (XXIII) 49 + (XXIV) 27 +(XXV) 17 + (XXVI) 1 + 20 + (XXVII) 36 + (XXVIII) 26 + (XXIX) 21 + (XXX) 26 + (XXXI) 18 + (XXXII) 32 + (XXXIII) 33 + (XXXIV) 31 + (XXXV) 15 + (XXXVI)38 + (XXXVII) 28 + (XXXVIII) 23 + (XXXIX) 29 +(XL) 49 + (XLI) 26 + (XLII) 20 + (XLIII) 27 + (XLIV)31 + (XLV) 25 + (XLVI) 24 + (XLVII) 23 + (XLVIII)35 = 1273.

י מנין פסוקיא דבספר יחזקאל אלף ומאתים ושבעים וארבעה. 2 Soncino 1485—86, Soncino 1488, and Naples 1491—93.

The Minor Prophets. — The St. Petersburg Codex groups all the twelve Minor Prophets together as one book, and states that it has 1050 verses. With this sum-total all the other MSS. agree. As some MSS., however, give the number of verses at the end of each book, and also quote the middle verses and moreover as there are some variations in the figures, I shall give each book separately.

Hosea. — All the MSS, agree that Hosea has 197 verses. This coincides with the verse-division and the number of verses given in each chapter of the book, as will be seen from the following analysis: (I) 9 + (II) 25 + (III) 5 + (IV) 19 + (V) 15 + (VI) 11 + (VII) 16 + (VIII) 14 + (IX)17 + (X) 15 + (XI) 11 + (XII) 15 + (XIII) 15 + (XIV)10 = 197. The mnemonic sign which I have given is in Arund. Oriental וסמן קבצ"ה. Dr. Baer's sign וסמן קבצ"ה I could not find in any MSS., and is probably his own invention. Arundel Orient. 16 gives in the Massoretic Summary at the end of this book VII 132 to as the middle verse which I have printed. But as this is the ninety-sixth verse, viz. 9 + 25 + 5 + 19 + 15 + 11 + 12 = 96, it leaves the second part with 100 verses. There must, therefore, have been some difference in the Schools in the verse-division, if this Massoretic half is not a mistake.

Jocl. — All the MSS., except one, give the number of verses in this book as 73. This agrees with the number in our editions, which is as follows: (I) 20 + (II) 27 + (III) 5 + (IV) 21 = 73. Arundel Or. 16, however, gives the number as 70, and II 18 as the middle verse. Hence, according to the ordinary computation, this leaves 38 verses for the first half of the book, and 35 verses for the second half. That there can be no clerical error in this

¹ The St. Petersburg Codex gives the sum-total of the Minor Prophets .תרי עשר אלף וחמשים.

MS. is evident, since the number is given in words, and is followed by a mnemonic sign of the same value. It is from this MS. that I have given the alternative reading in the Summary to my edition. The mnemonic sign 5 = 73 given by Dr. Baer is probably his own invention as I could not find it in the MSS.

Amos. — The statement in the Massoretic Summary at the end of this book, and in most of the MSS., that it contains 146 verses agrees with the sum-total of the verses in the chapters in our editions, as will be seen from the following analysis: (I) 15 + (II) 16 + (III) 15 + (IV) 13 + (V) 27 + (VI) 14 + (VII) 17 + (VIII) 14 + (IX) 15 = 146. Arundel Oriental 16, however, distinctly says that it has 144 verses, and gives the mnemonic sign to the same effect. This MS., moreover, gives Amos V 15 as the middle verse, which allots 74 verses to the first half and 70 to the second half, according to the ordinary computation of the verses. It appears to me that these discrepancies can only be reconciled on the supposition that the different statements are taken from different Massoretic Schools, where variants existed with regard to the verse-divisions.

Obadiah.—With regard to this book which has 21 verses, Arundel Oriental 16, as far I can trace it, is the only MS. which gives the middle verse, viz. verse 11.

Jonah. — There is no difference in the MSS. as regards the verses in Jonah. They all agree that it has 48 verses, which coincides with our editions, as may be seen from the following: (I) 16 + (II) 11 + (III) 10 + (IV) 11 = 48. Arundel Oriental 16 is again the only MS., which gives the middle verse, viz. II 8.

י סכום פסוקי דספרא דיואל שבעים, וסימן יייין, וחציו ויקנא יי לארצו ויחמל

Micah.—All the MSS. agree that this book has 105 verses, as follows: (I) 16 + (II) 13 + (III) 12 + (IV) 14 + (V) 14 + (VI) 16 + (VII) 20 = 105. Here again, Arund. Oriental 16 is the only MS. which gives the middle verse, viz. II 11. But this is manifestly a mistake since it asigns only 27 verses to the first half of the book, and leaves the second half with 78 verses. It will be seen that the Summary at the end of this book in my edition is taken from this MS.

Nahum. — In this book which according to the MSS. has 47 verses, viz. (I) 14 + (II) 14 + (III) 19 = 47, Arundel Oriental 16, gives II 10 as the middle verse.

Habakkuk.— There is a difference of opinion with regard to the number of verses in this book. Arundel Oriental 16 and Add. 15251 distinctly state that it has 57 verses, and give a mnemonic sign to the same effect, whilst Oriental 2201 and Harley 1528 as distinctly state that it has only 56 verses. The latter number, which is also given by Jacob b. Chayim in the first edition of his Rabbinic Bible, coincides with the number of verses in our editions, as will be seen from the following: (I) 17 + (II) 20 + (III) 19 = 56. Arundel Oriental 16 is again the only MS. which gives the middle verse, viz. II 12.

Zephaniah. — All the MSS. agree that this book has 53 verses. This coincides with the number of verses in our editions which is as follows: (I) 18 + (II) 15 + (III) 20 = 53. Here again, Arundel Oriental 16 gives the middle verse, viz. II 9.

Haggai. — The MSS. differ as to the number of verses in this book. Thus, Arundel Oriental 16 states that it has 37 verses³ and gives the mnemonic sign to the same effect, whilst Oriental 2201 and Harley 1528 declare that it has

¹ סכום פסוקי דסיפרא שבעה וחמשים וסימן ז"ן. 2 סך פסוקי של נביא חבקוק חמשים וששה.

³ סבים פסוקי הספרא שבעה ושלשים וסימן ל"ז.

38 verses. This is not only given by Jacob b. Chayim, but coincides with the number of verses in our editions, as will be seen from the following: (I) 15 + (II) 23 = 38. Arundel Oriental 16 which gives II 6 as the beginning of the second half, assigns 20 verses to the first half of the book and 18 verses to the second half, according to the present computation of the verses. The Massoretic Summary at the end of this book in Add. 152512 is due to a clerical error. The Scribe simply repeated here the Massoretic note from the previous book. Here again, Arundel Or. 16 is the only MS. which gives the middle verse, viz. II 6.

Zechariah. — All the MSS. agree that this book has 211 verses, which are as follows: (1) 17 + (II) 17 + (III) 10 + (IV) 14 + (V) 11 + (VI) 15 + (VII) 14 + (VIII) 23 + (IX) 17 + (X) 12 + (XI) 17 + (XII) 14 + (XIII) 9 + (XIV) 21 = 211. Arundel Oriental 16 gives the middle verse ³ Zech. X 41, which must be a mistake, since this gives for the first half 141 verses, viz. 17 + 17 + 10 + 14 + 11 + 15 + 14 + 23 + 17 + 3 = 141, and leaves the second half only 70 verses, viz. 9 + 17 + 14 + 9 + 21 = 70.

Malachi. — Arundel Oriental 16 says that this book has 54 verses and gives the mnemonic sign to the same effect.⁴ The other MSS. do not give the number of verses in this book separately, but the first edition of the Rabbinic Bible by Jacob b. Chayim, gives it as 55, which agrees with the number of verses in our editions, as will be seen from the following: (I) 14 + (II) 17 + (III) 24 = 55. Dr. Baer, who also gives the number 55, affixes to it the mnemonic sign 7^{n} = 55, which is his own making. Arundel Oriental 16 gives II 14 as the middle verse.

ו סכום פפוקו של נבוא שלשום ושמנה.

בר פסוקו" של ספר חנו חמשום ושלשה וסימן וֹן.וחצון ממנו פנה ממנו יחד ממנו קשת מלחמה.

י סכום פסוקי דספר מלאכי ארבעה וחמשים וסימן ד״ן.

From the above analysis it will be seen that the sum-total of the verses in the Minor Prophets, given in the Massoretic List, which is preseved in the Babylonian Codex (dated 916) agrees with the respective numbers assigned to each book separately in the majority of the MSS., which I have collated, viz. (Hosea) 197 + (Joel) 73 + (Amos) 146 + (Obadiah) 21 + (Jonah) 48 + (Micah) 105 + (Nahum) 47 + (Habakkuk) 56 + (Zephaniah) 53 + (Haggai) 38 + (Zechariah) 211 + (Malachi) 55 = 1050. It will also be seen that according to Arundel Oriental 16 which is one of the most magnificent MSS. in existence, belonging to the 13th century, and which is evidently a model Codex, there are only 1044 verses in the Minor Prophets, according to the separate number of verses assigned to each book in the respective Massoretic Summaries. The difference in the six verses, is due to the fact that in four books it has seven verses less: viz. in Joel it gives 70 verses instead of 73, in Amos it gives 144 instead of 146, in Haggai it gives 37 instead of 38, and in Malachi it gives 54 instead of 55, whilst in one book, i. e. Habakkuk, it gives 57 instead of 56, or one more verse than in the other MSS. Yet in the Massoretic Summary, which this very MS. appends to the Minor Prophets, it gives the sum-total as 1050 verses, and Micah III 12 as the middle verse 1 thus agreeing with the other MSS. It is, therefore, only natural to assume that the different Massoretic Summaries, which are appended to the separate books, are derived from different Lists belonging to Schools where other verse-divisions obtained.

The Hagiographa. — *Psalms*. The Massoretic Summary at the end of the Psalter states that it has 2527 verses, and that Ps. LXXVIII 36 is the middle verse. This entirely agrees with

י סכום פסוקי תרי עשר אלף וחמשים, וסימן הרהן, וחציו לכן בגללכם ציון

100

the sum-total of the verses in the present Psalms as will be seen from the following analysis: (I)6 + (II) 12 + (III) 9 + (IV)9 + (V) 13 + (VI) 11 + (VII) 18 + (VIII) 10 + (IX) 21 +(X) 18 + (XI) 7 + (XII) 9 + (XIII) 6 + (XIV) 7 + (XV) 5 + (XVI) 11 + (XVII) 15 + (XVIII) 51 + (XIX) 15 + (XX)10 + (XXI) 14 + (XXII) 32 + (XXIII) 6 + (XXIV) 10 +(XXV) 22 + (XXVI) 12 + (XXVII) 14 + (XXVIII) 9 + (XXIX) 11 + (XXX) 13 + (XXXI) 25 + (XXXII) 11 + (XXXIII) 22 + (XXXIV) 23 + (XXXV) 28 + (XXXVI)13 + (XXXVII) 40 + (XXXVIII) 23 + (XXXIX) 14 +(XL) 18 + (XLI) 14 + (XLII) 12 + (XLIII) 5 + (XLIV) 27 + (XLV) 18 + (XLVI) 12 + (XLVII) 10 + (XLVIII) 15 +(XLIX) 21 + (L) 23 + (LI) 21 + (LII) 11 + (LIII) 7 + (LIV) 9 + (LV) 24 + (LVI) 14 + (LVII) 12 + (LVIII) 12 + (LIX) 18 + (LX) 14 + (LXI) 9 + (LXII) 13 + (LXIII) 12 + (LXIV) 11 + (LXV) 14 + (LXVI) 20 + (LXVII) 8 + (LXVIII) 36 + (LXIX) 37 + (LXX) 6 + (LXXI) 24 + (LXXII) 20 + (LXXIII) 28 + (LXXIV) 23 + (LXXV) 11 + (LXXVI) 13 + (LXXVII) 21 + (LXXVIII) 36 + 36 + (LXXIX) 13+(LXXX) 20+(LXXXI) 17+(LXXXII) 8+ (LXXXIII) 19 + (LXXXIV) 13 + (LXXXV) 14 + (LXXXVI) 17 + (LXXXVII) 7 + (LXXXVIII) 19 + (LXXXIX) 53 + (XC) 17 + (XCI) 16 + (XCII) 16 + (XCIII) 5 + (XCIV) 23 + (XCV) 11 + (XCVI) 13 + (XCVII) 12 + (XCVIII) 9 + (XCIX) 9 + (C) 5 + (CI) 8 + (CII) 29 + (CIII) 22 + (CIV) 35 + (CV) 45 + (CVI) 48 +(CVII) 43 + (CVIII) 14 + (CIX) 31 + (CX) 7 + (CXI) 10 + (CXII) 10 + (CXIII) 9 + (CXIV) 8 + (CXV) 18 + $(CXVI)_{19} + (CXVII)_{2} + (CXVIII)_{29} + (CXIX)_{176} +$ (CXX) 7 + (CXXI) 8 + (CXXII) 9 + (CXXIII) 4 + (CXXIV) 8 + (CXXV) 5 + (CXXVI) 6 + (CXXVII) 5 + (CXXVIII) 6 + (CXXIX) 8 + (CXXXI) 8 + (CXXXI) 3 + (CXXXII) 18 + (CXXXIII) 3 + (CXXXIV) 3 + (CXXXV)21 + (CXXXVI) 26 + (CXXXVII) 9 + (CXXXVIII) 8 +

(CXXXIX) 24 + (CXL) 14 + (CXLI) 10 + (CXLII) 8 + (CXLIII) 12 + (CXLIV) 15 + (CXLV) 21 + (CXLVI) 10 + (CXLVII) 20 + (CXLVIII) 14 + (CXLIX) 9 + (CL) 6 = 2527. It is, however, to be remarked that this sum-total is according to the Westerns. The Easterns have three verses less, since they do not divide Ps. XXII 5, 6; LII 1, 2; LIII 1, 2 and CXXIX 5, 6, thus reading four verses instead of eight; whilst they divide Ps. XC 1 into two verses which yields a total of 2524, so far as their verse division is known at present.

Proverbs. — The statement in the Massoretic Summary at the end of this book that it contains 915 verses, and that XVI 18 is the middle verse, coincides with the number of verses in each chapter in our editions, as will be seen from the following: (I) 33 + (II) 22 + (III) 35 + (IV) 27 + (V) 23 + (VI) 35 + (VII) 27 + (VIII) 36 + (IX) 18 + (X) 32 + (XI) 31 + (XII) 28 + (XIII) 25 + (XIV) 35 + (XV) 33 + (XVI) 18 + 15 + (XVII) 28 + (XVIII) 24 + (XIX) 29 + (XX) 30 + (XXI) 31 + (XXII) 29 + (XXVII) 35 + (XXIV) 34 + (XXV) 28 + (XXVI) 28 + (XXVII) 27 + (XXVIII) 28 + (XXIX) 27 + (XXXII) 31 = 915.

Job. — Harley 5710—11, Arundel Oriental 16 which are standard Codices, and Oriental 2375 which represents the Yemen School, state in the Massoretic Summary at the end of this book that it has 1070 verses, and that the middle verse is XXII 16,1 whilst Oriental 2201, which is a very beautiful Spanish MS. dated A. D. 1246, and Add. 15251, which is one of the latest MSS., as distinctly state that it has 1075 verses and give the mnemonic sign to the same effect.² The sum-total of the verses, however, according to

י מספר פסוקי דספרא אלף ושכעים וחציו אשר קמטו ולא עת

the present verse-division as indicated in our text, is 1071 as will be seen from the following analysis: (I) 22 + (II)13 + (III) 26 + (IV) 21 + (V) 27 + (VI) 30 + (VII) 21 +(VIII) 22 + (IX) 35 + (X) 22 + (XI) 20 + (XII) 25 + (XIII)28 + (XIV) 22 + (XV) 35 + (XVI) 22 + (XVII) 16 +(XVIII) 21 + (XIX) 29 + (XX) 29 + (XXI) 34 + (XXII)16 + 14 + (XXIII) 17 + (XXIV) 25 + (XXV) 6 + (XXVI)14 + (XXVII) 23 + (XXVIII) 28 + (XXIX) 25 + (XXX) 31 +(XXXI) 40 + (XXXII) 23 + (XXXIII) 33 + (XXXIV) 37 +(XXXV) 16 +(XXXVI) 33 +(XXXVII) 24 +(XXXVIII)41 + (XXXIX) 30 + (XL) 32 + (XLI) 26 + (XLII) 17 = 1069. There is, therefore, a difference of one verse only between this number and the smaller sum given in the first named MSS. It is remarkable that the MSS, which give 1075 verses in this book, also mark XXII 16 as the middle verse. As this assigns to the first half 536 verses, the difference in the verse-division must to a great extent be in the second half according to the Massoretic Summary appended to these MSS.

Canticles. — All the MSS. give 117 verses as the number contained in this book, and IV 14 as the middle verse. This coincides with the number exhibited in our editions, as will be seen from the following: (I) 17 + (III) 17 + (III) 11 + (IV) 14 + 2 + (V) 16 + (VI) 12 + (VII) 14 + (VIII) 14 = 117.

Ruth. — The MSS. are equally unanimous in stating that this book has 85 verses, and that II 21 is the middle verse. This coincides with the number of verses in each chapter in our editions, viz. (I) 22 + (II) 21 + 2 (III) 18 + (IV) 22 = 85.

Lamentations. — There is also no difference in the MSS. with regard to the number of verses in this book which is given as 154, and the middle verse of which is stated to be III 34. This is exactly the number exhibited

in our editions as follows: (I) 22 + (II) 22 + (III) 34 + 32 + (IV) 22 + (V) 22 = 154.

Ecclesiastes. — According to the MSS. this book has 2222 verses, and the middle verse is VI 9. The editions exhibit the same number, which is as follows: (I) 18 + (II) 26 + (III) 22 + (IV) 17 + (V) 19 + (VI) 9 + 3 + (VII) 29 + (VIII) 17 + (IX) 18 + (X) 20 + (XI) 10 + (XII) 14 = 222.

Esther. — This book, according to the MSS., has 167 verses, and the middle verse is V 7. The following analysis shows that the editions faithfully follow the MSS.: (I) 22 + (II) 23 + (III) 15 + (IV) 17 + (V) 7 + 7 + (VI) 14 + (VII) 10 + (VIII) 17 + (IX) 32 + (X) 3 = 167. The Massoretic Summary at the end of this book in Harley 5710—11 gives the number of verses in this book¹ as 177, but this is manifestly a mistake, for ישכעים ought to be ישטו as is evident from the mnemonic sign. These MSS. which group the Five Megilloth together also give the sum-total of all the verses as 745, and they give Esther V 7 as the middle verse.

Daniel. — Oriental 2201; Harley 5710—11 and Oriental 2375 state that this book has 357 verses, and that the middle verse is VI 17.2 This coincides with the verse-division in the present text as will be seen from the following analysis: (I) 21 + (II) 49 + (III) 33 + (IV) 34 + (V) 30 + (VI) 11 + 18 + (VII) 28 + (VIII) 27 + (IX) 27 + (X) 21 + (XI) 45 + (XII) 13 = 357. The statement in the Massoretic Summary at the end of this book in Add. 15251 that it contains 308 verses 3 is manifestly due to a clerical error, as is evident from the fact that VI 11 is here given as the middle verse which

ם מנות ושבעה ושבעה מאה ושבעה ושימנהון קֹבוֹ.

² סכום פסוקי של דניאל שלש מאות וחמשים ושבעה.

³ סכום פסוקי דרניאל שלש מאות ושמנה וחציו גבריא אלה הרגשו.

104

assigns 179 verses to the first half, thus leaving 179 verses for the second half making a total of 358. This is exactly the number of verses according to the computation of our present text. Jacob b. Chayim, who also states that this book contains 357 verses, gives V 30 as the middle verse. This, however, is a mistake as is partly indicated in the last word which does not occur in chap. V 30, but is to be found in VI 12.

Ezra-Nehemiah. — According to Harley 5710—11, Oriental 2212 and Oriental 2375 this book has 685 verses and Nehemiah III 32 is the middle verse.2 This coincides with the sum-total of the number of the verses in the separate chapters in the present editions, as will be seen from the following analysis: (I) 11 + (II) 70 + (III) 13 + (IV) 24 + (V) 17 + (VI) 22 + (VII) 28 + (VIII) 36 + (IX) 15 + (X) 44 + (Neh. I) 11 + (II) 20 + (III) 32 + 6 + (IV) 17+ (V) 19 + (VI) 19 + (VII) 72 + (VIII) 18 + (IX) 37 +(X) 40 + (XI) 36 + (XII) 47 + (XIII) 31 = 685. Arundel Oriental 16, however, and Add. 15251 expressly state that it has 688 verses, and give the mnemonic sign to the same effect.3 Jacob b. Chayim in the first edition of his Rabbinic Bible combines the two statements, in the Massoretic Summary at the end of the book. In expressing the numbers he gives 688 verses, whilst in the mnemonic sign he has The two different statements manifestly proceed from different Massoretic Schools which preserved variations in the verse-divisions.

Chronicles. — Harley 5710—11, Arundel Oriental 16 and Add. 15251 state that Chronicles has 1765 verses, and that I Chron. XXV 23 begins the second half of the book. This coincides with the sum-total of the verses in

וחציו ביה בליליא קטיל בלשאצר הרגישו.

² מכום הפיסוקים של ספר שש מאות ושמונים וחמשה סימן תרעה. 3 מכום פסוקי דעזרא שש מאות ושמנים ושמנה. סימן פחם סימן.

CHAP. VI.

the separate chapters as will be seen from the following analysis: (I) 54 + (II) 55 + (III) 24 + (IV) 43 + (V) 41 +(VI) 66 + (VII) 40 + (VIII) 40 + (IX) 44 + (X) 14 + (XI) 47 + (XII) 41 + (XIII) 14 + (XIV) 17 + (XV) 29 + (XVI) 43+ (XVII) 27 + (XVIII) 17 + (XIX) 19 + (XX) 8 + (XXI) 30+ (XXII) 19 + (XXIII) 32 + (XXIV) 31 + (XXV) 31 +(XXVI) 32 + (XXVII) 24 + 10 + (XXVIII) 21 + (XXIX) 30+ (1 Chron. l) 18 + (II) 17 + (III) 17 + (IV) 22 + (V) 14 + (VI) 42 + (VII) 22 + (VIII) 18 + (IX) 31 + (X) 19 +(XI) 23 + (XII) 16 + (XIII) 23 + (XIV) 14 + (XV) 19 + $(XVI)_{14} + (XVII)_{19} + (XVIII)_{34} + (XIX)_{11} + (XX)_{37}$ + (XXI) 20 + (XXII) 12 + (XXIII) 21 + (XXIV) 27 +(XXV) 28 + (XXVI) 23 + (XXVII) 9 + (XXVIII) 27 + (XXIX) 36 + (XXX) 27 + (XXXI) 21 + (XXXII) 33 +(XXXIII) 25 + (XXXIV) 33 + (XXXV) 27 + (XXXVI) 23= 1765. The Massoretic statement, therefore, at the end of this book in the editio princeps of Jacob b. Chayim's Rabbinic Bible that it has 1565 verses 1 must be a misprint. How Dr. Baer came to say that this Rabbinic Bible stated the number of verses to be 16562 passes my comprehension.

Though no such detailed numbering of the verses of the sectional divisions in the separate books exists in the case of the Prophets and the Hagiographa, yet a List has been preserved which not only divides each book into two halves, but gives the middle verse of each of the groups of the Prophets and the Hagiographa. It also divides each such group into fourths so that the number of verses in every subdivision may easily be ascertained. I subjoin this List from a Yemen MS.³ of the Hagiographa in the British Museum.

בסוקים של ספר דברי הימים אלף וחמש מאות וששים וחמשה.בסוקים שאות וחמשים וששה.

³ Oriental 2212, fol. 228 a.

The Pentateuch has 5845 verses.

The Prophets have 9294 verses.

The Hagiographa have 8064 verses.

The Scriptures altogether have 23203 verses.

The following two verses are the mnemonic sign:

'And all the days that Adam lived were 930 years.' [Gen. V 5.]

'And all the firstborn males by the number of names were 22373.' [Numb. III 43] 930 + 22273 = 23203.

The sign thereof is: 'Remember man that nothing must be put to it nor any thing be taken from it: and God doeth it that men should fear before him.' [Eccl. III 14.]

The middle verse of the Prophets is Isa. XVII 3.

The first fourth of the Former Prophets is Judg. XV 4.

The middle verse of the Former Prophets is 2 Sam. III 12.

The last fourth of the Former Prophets is I Kings XII 24.

The first fourth of the Latter Prophets is Isa. LXV 23.

The middle verse of the Latter Prophets is Jerem. XLIX 9.

The last fourth of the Latter Prophets is Ezek. XLI 7.

The first fourth of the Hagiographa is Ps. XX 10.

The middle verse of the Hagiographa is Ps. CXXX 3.

The last fourth of the Hagiographa is Prov. XXV 13.

סכום הפיסוקים של תורה חמשת אלפים ושמונה מאות וארבעים וחמשה הֹףְ מֹה סכום הפיסוקים של נביאים תשעת אלפים ומאתים ותשעים וארבעה סימנ' מרצה סכום הפיסוקים של כתובים שמונת אלפים וששים וארבעה וסימנה' חֹסֹר. כל המקרא כולו שלושה ועשרים אלף ומאתים ושלושה סימן כֹג רֹג וכולם כלולים בשני פיסוקים ויהיו כל ימי אדם אשר חי תשע מאות שנה ושלשים

ויהי כל בכור זכר במספר שמות מבן חדש ומעלה לפקדיהם שנים ועשרים אלף שלשה ושבעים ומאתים:

אמת

סימן זכר אדם עליו אין להוסיף וממנו אין לרגיע והאלהים עשה שייראו מלפניו: חצי הנביאים ונשבת מבצר מאפרים:

רביעית הראשון של ארבע הספרים הראשנים וילך שמשון וילכד שלש מאות שווילית:

הצי ארבע ספרים הראשנים וישלח אבנר מלאכים אל דוד:

רביעית ארבע ספרים הראשנים השני אמר י״י לא תעלו ולא תלחמו עם אחיכם: רביעית ארבע ספרים האהרונים לא יינעו לריק ולא ילדו לבהלה:

חצי ארבע הספרים האחרונים אם בצרים באו לך הלוא ישאירו: רביעית השני של ארבע ספרים האחרונים ורחבה ונסבה למעלה:

רביעים הכתובים י"י הושיעה המלך יענינו ביום קראינו: חצי הכתובים אם עונות תשמר יה י"י מי יעמד:

רביעית הכתובים השני כצנת שלג ביום קציר ציר נאמן לשלחיו:

Apart from these sum-totals indicated in the margin against the respective places, or in the Massoretic Summaries at the end of each book, there is no numeration of the verses in the MSS. or in the early editions of the Hebrew Bible. The introduction of the numbers against each verse is of comparatively late date. As far as I can trace it, the small Hebrew Psalter published by Froben, Basle 1563, is the first portion of the Hebrew Bible with the Arabic numerals in the margin against each verse. But these numerals which Froben adopted from the Latin Quincuplex Psalter published by Stephens in 1509 do not agree with the Massoretic verse-divisions.

According to the Massorah the titles are a constituent part of the Psalm, and hence, have not only the ordinary verse-divisions, but are counted as the first verse, or the first two verses according to their length and contents. Thus the title of Ps. LX has no number in the Froben Psalter, and accordingly this Psalm has only twelve verses marked in the margin, whereas in the Hebrew the title constitutes two verses, and the Psalm has fourteen verses. If the student were to test the Massoretic numbers by the notation given in this edition, or for that matter by the numerals exhibited in the Authorised Version, he would be involved in hopeless contradiction.

Arias Montanus, who was the first to break up the Hebrew text into the Christian chapters and to introduce the Hebrew numerals into the body of the text itself, was also the first who, seven years later, expanded this plan. He attached the Arabic numerals in the margin against each verse throughout the whole Hebrew Bible published at Antwerp in 1571. As far as the Jews were

¹ For a description of this Psalter see Bibliotheca Sussexiana Vol. I, Part II, fol. 103 &c.

concerned he precluded the possibility of their using this splendid edition with the interlinear Latin translation, because he wantonly placed the sign of the Cross at every verse-division throughout the whole Hebrew text. The statement, therefore, which is often made, that Athias, whose edition of the Hebrew Bible appeared ninety years later (1659—61), was the first who introduced the numerals against the verses, is inaccurate.

Chap. VII.

The Number of the Words.

Though the ancient authorities inform us that the guild of Scribes who numbered the verses, also counted the words,1 it is beyond the scope of this Introduction to enter into a datailed discussion on the accuracy or otherwise of the sum-total of words in the whole Bible The case, however, is different as far as the Pentateuch is concerned. The splendid MS. No. 1 in the Madrid University Library which is dated A. D. 1280 and the Standard Codex No. 1 in the Imperial and Royal Court Library Vienna give the number of words in every Parasha throughout the whole Pentateuch. Jacob b. Chayim had evidently no knowledge of the existence of this Massoretic List, since it is only at the end of six out of the fifty-four Parashas that he gives the number of words. As the numbers given both in the Madrid List and in the fragments preserved by Jacob b. Chayim in the editio princeps do not agree with the number I give at the end of each Parasha I am obliged to notice the difference.

It so happens that I possess a MS. of the Pentateuch in which every two pages are followed by a page containing two tables. These tables register line for line, the number of times each letter of the Alphabet occurs in the two corresponding pages, as well as the number of words in each line. At the end of each table, the sum-total is given of each separate letter, and of the words in the pages in question.

¹ Vide supra, p. 64.

Text and Table of the

															an				0j		
ריטר ר	l u	ש	٦	ק	r	r	ŋ	פ	ע	ם	7	כ	_	2	5	7	ב	-	2	ח	,
																	Г				
7	3	2	3	*	1	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	2	1	1	*	*	3	*	*	*
9	3	1	2	*	1	*	*	1	1	*	*	1	1	*	1	1	*	2	*	2	*
8	1	*	2	*	*	*	*	2	1	*	*	1	3	3	3	*	*	7	*	1	*
9	1	*	4	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	1	*	1	*	1	5	1	*	*
8	*	1	2	1	*	*	*	*	*	*	2	*	2	*	3	1	*	6	*	1	*
9	*	1	4	2	*	*	*	*	1	*	*	*	1	*	4	1	*	6	*	1	*
2	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	1	*	*	*	*	1	*	1	*
8	1	*	2	1	*	*	*	*	1	*	*	*	2	3	2	1	*	9	*	*	*
9	1	1	1	1	*	*	*	*	2	*	2	*	3	2	3	*	*	8	*	*	*
8	2	2	3	1	*	*	*	*	2	*	1	*	2	4	2	*	*	4	*	1	*
8	*	1	3	3	*	*	*	*	2	*	1	*	2	1	3	*	1	9	*	*	*
5	*	1	2	1	*	*	*	*	1	*	*	1	1	*	*	*	*	4	*	*	*
8	2	1	1	2	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	4	5	2	*	*	5	*	1	*
7	1	1	2	1	*	*	*	*	*	*	1	*	1	*	1	*	1	5	*	1	*
8	*	1	3	2	1	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	3	3	3	*	*	6	*	*	*
8	*	1	3	2	1	*	*	*	1	*	*	*	1	1	1	*	1	3	1	*	*
11	*	2	6	*	1	*	*	2	6	*	*	1	*	2	2	*	*	4	*	*	3
8	1	2	3	*	2	1	*	*	2	*	1	*	*	1	*	*	1	3	*	*	1
9	*	2	4	*	1	*	*	1	4	*	*	2	*	2	2	*	*	3	*	*	2
9	*	*	3	1	*	*	*	*	1	*	*	*	2	*	1	*	1	8	1	*	*
1	*	2	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	1	*	*	2	*	*	*
7	1	1	3	1	*	*	*	*	1	*	*	*	2	3	3	*	*	7	*	*	*
8	2	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	1	*	2	*	3	2	5	*	*	8	*	*	*
7	1	2	3	1	*	*	*	*	2	*	*	1	2	2	3	*	*	5	*	*	*
8	2	2	2	*	1	*	*	*	1	*	1	1	1	1	1	*	1	5	*	*	*
7	3	1	. 1	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	2	3	4	*	*	2	*	*	*
196							i												İ	Ī	
766	25	28	62	20	9	1	*	6	30	*	11	œ	42	39	52	4	7	130	లు	9	6

first page of the MS.

٦	=	٦	:	=	×	אותיות	Genesis I 1—16.
1	3	*	*	2	6	28	א בַּרָאשִית בָּרָא אֱלֹהִים אַת הַשְּׁמִיִם וְאַת הָאָרֶץ:
8	6	*	*	1	1	33	וְהָאָרֶץ הָוְתָה תֹהוּ וָבֹהוּ וְחשֶׁךְ עַל־פְּנֵי תְהוֹם וְרוּהַ 2
1	4	*	*	*	3	32	3 אַלהִים מָרַהַפָּת עַלּ־פָּנֵי הַמָּיִם: וַיֹּאמֶר אֵלהִים יְהִי
6	3	*	*	1	6	30	4 אור נוהו־אור: נורא אֱלהים אֶת־הָאוֹר בִּי־מוֹכ
4	4	1	*	3	4	35	5 וַנַבְדֵּל אֵלהִים בֵּין הָאוֹר וּבֵין הַחשֶׁךְּ : וַיְּקְרָא אֱלֹהִים
5	3	*	*	2	2	33	לָאוֹר ווֹם וְלַחשֶׁךְ סָרָא לְיִלְה וַוְהִי־שֶׁרֶב וַיְהִי־בֹּקֶר
1	*	1	*	*	1	6	יים אָקד:
3	4	1	*	2	2	34	6 ניאמר אֱלחִים וְהִי רָקִיעַ בְּתֹּיְהְ הַפְּנִם וִיהִי מַבְהִּיל
2	2	1	*	3	2	34	ז בֵּין מַיִם לָמָיִם: וַיַעשׁ אֱלֹהִים אֶת־נְיָרָקִיעַ וַיִּבְדֵּל בֵּין
1	2	*	*	1	2	30	הַפֵּיִם אֲשֶׁר מִהַּחַת לֶרֶקִיַע וּבֵּין הַפַּיִם אֲשֶׁר מֵעַל
3	3	*	*	*	2	34	8 לָרָקועַ וַיְהִי־בֵן: וַיִּקְרָא אֱלֹהִים לֶרָקועַ שְׁמָיִם וַיְהִי־
2	1	*	*	2	*	16	עֶרֶב וַיְהִי־בֹּבֶּרְר יוֹם שֵׁנִי:
4	3	*	*	*	3	33	9 וַיאמֶר אֱלחִים יָקְווּ הַמַּיִם מִתַּחַת הַשְּׁמִים אֶל־מָקוֹם
3	5	1	*	1	4	29	10 אַחַר וְהַרָאָה הַנַּפָּשָׁה וַוְהִידבּן: וַיָּקְרָא אֱלֹהִים
3	4	*	*	1	4	34	לַיַבָּשָׁה אֶרֶין וּלְמִקְוָה הַפֵּיִם קָרָא וַמִּים וַיַּרָא אֱלהִים
2	2	2	*	2	5	29	11 בִּי־טיב: וַיאֹמֶר אֱלהִים תַּדְּשׁא הָאָרֶן דָּשָׁא עֵשֶׂב
3	1	*	*	1	1	35	מַוְרַיַע זָרַע צִין בָּרִי עשֶׁה בְּרִי לְמִינוֹ אֲשֶׁר וַרְעוֹ־בוֹ עַל־
3	3	1	*	1	4	30	12 הָאָרֶץ וַיְהִי־כָּן: וַתּוֹצֵא הָאָרֶץ דֶּשֶׁא עַשֶׂב מִוֹרִיעַ
5	3	*	*	1	1	33	וַרַע לְמִינָהוּ וִעֵין עשֶׁה־בָּרִי אֲשֶׁר וַרְע״ב׳ לְמִינָהיּ
5	3	*	*	3	2	31	13 וַיָּרֵא אֱלֹהִים בִּיִיטוֹב: וַיְהִידעֶרֶב וַיְהִידבֹקֶר יים
*	*	*	*	*	*	5	ָּיִטֶּלְיּשָׁי: ישלְישָׁי:
1	4	1	*	2	3	33	11 ניאמֶר אֱלהִים וְהִי מְארת בּּרְקִיעַ הַשְּׁמִים לְהַבְּהִיל
7	4	1	*	2	1	38	בין הַיּוֹם וּבֵין הַלָּילָה וְהָיוּ לְאֹתֹת וּלְמֹיעֲרִים וּלְיָמִים
4	3	*	*	1	2	32	15 וְשָׁנִים: וְהָיוּ לִמְאוֹרוֹת בִּרְקוֹעַ הַשְּׁמֵיִם לְהָאִיר עַל־
2	4	*	*	*	4	29	16 הַאָּרֶץ וַיְהִי־בֵּן: וַיַּעֵשׁ אֱלֹהִים אֶת־שְׁנֵי הַמְּאֹרֹת 16
3	4	2	2	*	3	30	הַגְּדֹלִים אֶת־הַמָּאוֹר הַגָּדֹל לְמֶמְשֶׁלֶת הַיוֹם וְאֶת־
		_				766	
82	78	12		32	68	.00	
12	œ	2	2	25	œ		

Introduction.

To convey a proper idea of the minuteness and accuracy with which this plan is worked out throughout the entire Pentateuch, I give on pp. 110, 111 a copy of the first page of the MS. containing Gen. I I—16 with the table belonging to it.

By this means I have been able to control the Massoretic Summaries with respect to the number of letters and words in the Pentateuch, and it is from this MS. that I appended the sum-total to each *Parasha*, and at the end of each book of the Pentateuch. It is with the aid here afforded, that the inaccuracy of the sum-totals given in some of the *Parashas* in both these MSS. as well as in Jacob b. Chayim's Massoretic fragments become apparent.

Thus the Madrid Codex No. 1, from which in conjunction with the Grammatico-Massoretic Treatise in the Yemen MSS. I printed the Summaries at the end of each Parasha, no fewer than ten out of the fifty-four Parashas have incorrect sum-totals of words. They are exhibited in the following Table where the Arabic figures before each Parasha describe its number according to the sequence of the fifty-four Parashas in the Annual Cycle.

Table showing the variations in the number of words in the Parasha.

	Parashas	Madrid MS.	My MS.
8	ישלח [= Gen. XXXII 4—XXXVI 43	1976	1996
10	מקץ [= " XLI 1—XLIV 17	1871	2022
11	וינש [= " XLIV 18—XLVII 27	1469	1480
I 2	יהי [= " XLVII 28— L 26	1149	1158
14	ארא [= Exod. VI 2—IX 35	1523	1748
34	במרבר [= Numb. I 1-IV 20	1893	1823
39	ו XIX I—XXII ו (== ", "XIX I	1445	1245
41	בינחם [= " XXV וס-XXX ו	1886	1887
50	כי תבוא [= Deut. XXVI ו-XXIX 8	1746	1747
53	ראויט [= " XXXII 1−5	614	615
		15572	15721

As the sum-totals in the forty-four Parashas agree with the numbers in my MS., there is no doubt that the variations exhibited in the Madrid Codex in these ten Parashas are due to clerical errors. I have, therefore, substituted in all these instances the numbers in accordance with the Tables in my MS.

From the Tables in my MS., moreover, it is also evident that the sum-totals of words given in the printed Massorah in the editio princeps of Jacob b. Chayim's Rabbinic Bible at the end of six Parashas is incorrect and must be corrected as follows:

- (10) מקץ [= Gen. XLI 1-XLIV 17], which according to the printed Massorah has 2025 words, ought only to have 2022 words.
- קרח (38) קרח [= Numb. XVI וו –XVIII 32], which the printed Massorah tells us has 1462 words,2 ought to be 1409 words.
- (39) חקת [= Numb. XIX 1—XXII 1], which according to the printed Massorah has 1454 words,3 ought to be 1245 words.
- (40) בלק [= Numb. XXII 2—XXV 9], which it says has 1450 words, 4 ought to be 1455 words.
- (45) ואחנן [= Deut. III 23—VII 11], which the Massorah states has 1870 words, 5 ought to be 1878 words and
- (46) עקב [= Deut. VII 12—XI 25], which the Massorah tells us has 1746 words, 6 ought to be 1747 words.

The Number of the Letters.

Still more glaring is the sum-total of the number of letters in Genesis which the Massorah gives in the Summary at the end of this book. Here the printed Massorah tells us that Genesis has 4395 letters,7 whereas it has 87064.

- ו ותיבות אלפים כ״ה.
 - 2 ותיבות אלף תם"ב.
 - 3 ותיבות אלף תנ"ד.
 - ותיבות אלף ת"נ.
- ז ותיבות אלף תת"ע. 6 ותיבות אלף תשמ"ו.

Part II.

The text itself.

Hitherto I have dwelt upon the outer form of the text into which I have introduced changes in accordance with the Massoretic rules. I shall now describe the condition of the text itself and how far it has been affected by the principles which have guided me in preparing it.

Chap. I.

Dagesh and Raphe.

In all Massoretic MSS. of all Schools, whether Spanish, Italian, Franco-Italian or German, not only are the aspirated letters (בנדכפת), uniformly denoted by Raphe, but the silent Aleph (x) in the middle of a word, and the He (\sqcap), both in the middle and at the end of words, are duly marked with the horizontal stroke. Thus for instance מיאמר and he said (Gen. I 3 &c.), פַּהַבּעוּר (Numb. I 10 &c.) בֹאַכָה נַרָרָה as thou comest to Gerar (Gen. X 19). The only exceptions are (1) when the aspirate has a superlinear accent, in which case it would be difficult to place both the horizontal on the top of the letter, and stroke and the accent (2) in the ineffable name יהוה which never has the Raphe on the final He. Indeed there are some MSS. which have the Raphe even on the consonants with the superlinear accents, though it mars the evenness of the lines.

The editors of the first edition of the Pentateuch (Bologna 1482) conscientiously endeavoured to reproduce these Raphes in the first few folios, but owing to typographical difficulties which at that early stage of Hebrew printing the compositors could not overcome, they used it very sparingly after folios 4b. The printers of Lisbon, however, who nine years later published the magnificent fourth edition of the Pentateuch in 1491, and who issued from the same printing office the books of Isaiah and Jeremiah, faithfully reproduced the Raphes as they are exhibited in all the Massoretically pointed MSS. The less skilful printers, however, could not easily express the aspirates with the horizontal stroke. Hence, they disappeared altogether in the editions subsequent to 1492. But whatever excuse may be made for the early printers on the score of typographical difficulties, there is no justification for modern editors who profess faithfully to reproduce the Massoretic text, for their departure from the uniform practice of all the MSS. I have, therefore, reverted to the correct Lisbon editions of 1491 and 1492 and restored in form the Massoretic text in accordance with the Massoretic MSS., disregarding the enormous labour which it entailed upon me of minutely examining every consonant for the purpose of horizontally marking all the letters which have the Raphe in the MSS.

From time immemorial, the custodians of the Hebrew Scriptures have enjoined it most strictly that those who are engaged in public reading are to exercise the greatest care to pronounce very distinctly every letter and to impart to every consonant its proper value. But beyond this injunction they have attached no visible sign to any particular letter, which in their estimation might preclude its being weakened or absorbed by another letter in close conjunction therewith. At a later time, however, one or

two isolated purists resorted to the expedient of putting a Dagesh into letters in certain positions to safeguard their distinct pronunciation. Hence, Yekuthiel the Naktan states that in some MSS. the letter Nun at the beginning of the name in the phrase לוֹכ the son of Nun (Deut. XXXII 4) has a Dagesh. Though Yekuthiel himself does not give here the reason for this abnormal position of the Dagesh, it is manifest that the purist who inserted it thereby intended to guard this Nun at the beginning of the word against being absorbed or weakened in pronunciation by the Nun which ends the preceding word.

Heidenheim, who first called attention to Yekuthiel's remark, declares that this practice obtained wherever two of the same letters occurred, one at the end of a word and one at the beginning of the immediately following word. In such a case a Dagesh is put in the initial letter to guard it from being absorbed. In the Haphtara to Bereshith, viz. Isa. XLII 5-XLIII 10, where he gives the reason for putting a Dagesh in the Nun of אַנְּיָלֵי breath (Isa. XLII 5), he also quotes the following: מול בילי מול מול מול לאבל־בְּשׁבוּן to ead bread (Gen.

¹ It is remarkable that in the edition of the עיין הקורא in Heidenheim's Pentateuch, Yekuthiel's words on Deut. XXXII 44 are as follows: יש אספמיים אספמיים there are Spanish Codices which have Dagesh in the Nun to guard it from being absorbed by its neighbour which is close to it. This indeed makes Yekuthiel himself give the reason, whereas in the two MSS. of Yekuthiel's Ayin Hakorē in the British Museum, it is simply במקצ' האספמ' נון דנ' וכן קורין העולם וכן במס"ה. וכל קר' כתכו לקר' בנון וקר' בנון במקצ' האספמ' נון דנ' וכן קורין העולם וכן במס"ה. וכל קר' כתכו קון וקר' בנון יקר' בנון במס"ה וכל היי במסה מקומות sedition also differs materially throughout from these MSS. Heidenheim's own words on Yekuthiel's remark are as follows: חוברתי וה בכמה מקומות שכן מנהגם בכל שתי אותיות דומות זאת בסוף התיבה ושתיבה ושתיהן דבוקות כדי להשמר מן ההבלע אלא שלפעמים נשו מפסק ביניהם כשיתכן שם פסוק ולפעמים העמידו התיבה הראשונה במתג בסוף כשניגונו מלעיל.

XXXI אל־לֶב to heart (Mal. II 2), להם מִיגון unto them from sorrow (Esther IX 22) &c.1

We shall now contrast the prototype with the copy by Drs. Baer and Delitzsch which is as follows:

This Dagesh is in accordance with the correct MSS, and is in accordance with the rule that when in two words which belong to one another, the same two consonants follow each other, the one at the end of one word and the other at the beginning of the next word, the second of these consonants is furnished with Dagesh as a sign that this letter is to be read with special emphasis, so that it may not be absorbed and rendered inaudible by careless and hasty reading in the former identical letter. In the current editions this Dagesh is absent, because its import has not been understood.²

Delitzsch, moreover, illustrates this use of the Dagesh by adducing the following six instances from the Psalms: (ו) בכל־לְבי Ps. IX 2; (וועמל בְּמִנוֹ XV 3; (מֹ בַּבְּרַלְּבִי XXVI 4; עם־מָּחִי (מַ בְּרָר לֹאנִם מֵּים (בּר לֹאנִם מֵּים (5 and 6) ועמל לְאמים (VII 35, and he assures us that this is to be found in the correct Codices. From the fact, however, that he relies upon Heidenheim's remarks in corroboration of this statement,

Comp. the preceding note in Heidenheim's Pentateuch called מאור with Yekuthiel's עיין הקורא published in five Vols. Rödelheim 1818—21.
The *Haphtara* in question is in the Appendix to Vol. I.

² Dieses Dagesch steht nach dem Vorbilde correcter Handschriften und nach der Regel, dass, wenn in zwei zusammengehörigen Wörtern zwei gleiche Consonanten, der eine am Ende des ersten und der andere am Anfange des zweiten Wortes, einander folgen, der zweite dieser Consonanten ein Dagesch erhält, und zwar als Merkzeichen, dass dieser Buchstabe mit besonderem Ausdruck zu lesen ist, damit er nicht bei sorglos eiligem Lesen in den vorigen gleichen Buchstaben verschlungen und unhörbar werde.* In den gangbaren Druckausgaben fehlt dieses Dagesch. Man hat es vernachlässigt, weil man seinen Zweck nicht kannte. Zeitschrift für die gesammte lutherische Theologie und Kirche, Vol. XXIV, p. 413, Leipzig 1863.

^{*} Siehe Heidenheim's Besprechung der Sache in seinem Pentateuch-Commentar zu Anfang der Haftarath Bereschith und Desselben Pentateuch-Ausgabe Meor Enajim zu Deut. 32, 44.

it is evident that Delitzsch himself did not examine the Codices, nor was he aware that Heidenheim's version of Yekuthiel is contrary to the MSS.

But Yekuthiel, upon whom the whole of this fabric is reared, treats only upon the single phrase מבינון and makes no allusion whatever to the existence of the *Dagesh* in the second of the two identical consonants in any other combination. And even with regard to בֹוְ־נוֹן itself, he does not say that this is the orthography in correct MSS., but simply remarks "in some Spanish Codices the Nun has Dagesh".

What, however, is still more surprising, is the fact that of the twenty-nine instances, in which מכיכון occurs in the Hebrew Bible, no fewer than sixteen are to be found in the Pentateuch alone, and that Heidenheim himself, who formulated this rule in connection with this very phrase, has not inserted the Dagesh in the second Nun in a single passage. And though this absence of the Dagesh is in accordance with most of the Codices and with all the editions, yet Dr. Baer has inserted it in all the passages wherever מבורנון occurs in the parts of the Hebrew Bible which he has published.

The other instances adduced by Heidenheim and Delitzsch in illustration of this supposed canon require a more detailed examination since some modern Grammarians, who have not had an opportunity to examine the MSS. for themselves, have accepted this orthography as a fact. The following are the five passages adduced by Heidenheim and the six instances quoted by Delitzsch arranged in the order of the books in the Hebrew Bible with the MSS. which testify against their orthography.

¹ Comp. Exod. XXXIII 11; Numb. XI 28; XIII 8, 16; XIV 6, 30, 38; XXVI 65; XXVII 18; XXXII 12, 28; XXXIV 17; Deut. I 38; XXXI 23; XXXII 44; XXXIV 9.

(1) Gen. XXXI 54; XXXVII 25.

with Dagesh, Heidenheim and Baer.

without Dagesh, Orient. 4445 the oldest MS. extant; Arundel Orient. 2 dated A. D. 1216; Orient. 2201 dated A. D. 1246; Add. 9401—9402 dated A. D. 1286; Harley 5710—11; Add. 21160; Add. 15451; Harley 1528; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Orient. 4227; Orient. 2626-28; Orient. 2348; Orient. 2349; Orient. 2350; the first edition of the Pentateuch Bologna 1482; the first edition of the entire Bible 1488; the Lisbon edition of the Pentateuch 1491; the second edition of the Bible, Naples 1491-93; the third edition of the Bible, Brescia 1494; the Complutensian Polyglot; the first Rabbinic Bible by Felix Pratensis, Venice 1517; the second quarto Bible, Bomberg 1521, and the first edition of the Bible with the Massorah by Jacob b. Chayim, Venice 1524-25.

(2) Isaiah XLII 5.

נתן נשמה with Dagesh, Heidenheim.

מול נשמה without Dagesh, Babylon Codex dated A. D. 916; Orient. 2201; Harley 5710—11; Arund. Orient. 16; Add. 15451; Harley 1528; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Orient. 1478; Orient. 2091; Orient. 4227; Orient. 2626—28; the Lisbon edition of Isaiah 1492 and all the early editions specified under No. 1. Now Orient. 1478 is the remarkable Jerusalem MS. which Dr. Baer has collated and which he quotes in his notes on Ps. III 7, yet he omitted to state that this Codex has not the Dagesh in question. Indeed he himself has violated this eccentric rule by omitting the Dagesh here, though

¹ Comp. The Massorah, Vol. II, Preface, fol. 3.

Heidenheim adduces this passage in confirmation of this canon.

(3) Isaiah LIV 17.

וכל־לְשוֹן with Dagesh, Baer.

ובל־לְּשׁוֹן without Dagesh, Babylon Codex; Orient. 2201;
Harley 5710—11; Arund. Orient. 16; Add. 15451;
Harley 1528; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252;
Orient. 1478; Orient. 2091; Orient. 4227; Orient. 2626—28 and all the early editions.

(4) Psalm IX 2.

with Dagesh, Baer.

מכל־לָבי without Dagesh, Orient. 2201; Harley 5710—11; Arund. Orient. 16; Add. 15451; Harley 1528; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Orient. 2091; Orient. 4227; Orient. 2626—28; the first edition of the Hagiographa, Naples 1486—87, and all the early editions.

(5) Psalm XV 3.

על־לשנו with Dagesh, Baer.

על־לְשנו without Dagesh, Orient. 2201; Harley 5710—11; Arund. Orient. 16; Add. 15451; Harley 1528; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Orient. 2091; Orient. 4227; Orient. 2626—28 and all the early editions

(6) Psalm XXVI 4.

עם מְחי with Dagesh, Baer.

עם מְחֹי without Dagesh, Orient. 2201; Harley 5710—11; Arund. Or. 16; Add. 15451; Harley 1528; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Orient. 2091; Orient. 4227; Orient. 2626—28 and all the early editions.

(7) Psalm CV 44.

ועמל לאמים with Dagesh, Baer.

ועמל לאמים without Dagesh, all the above named MSS. and all the editions without a single exception.

- (8, 9) Psalm CVII 35.
 - ישם מדבר לאגם מים with Dagesh, Baer.
 - ישם מֶדבר לאנם מֵים without Dagesh, all the MSS. and all the editions without an exception.
 - (10) Malachi II 2.
 - על־לָב with Dagesh, Baer.
 - על־לֶב without Dagesh, all the MSS. and all the editions without exception.
 - (11) Esther IX 22.

with Dagesh.

להם מינון without Dagesh, all the MSS. and all the editions without an exception.

It will thus be seen that not a single one of the eleven instances which Heidenheim and Dr. Baer have adduced in illustration of the rule formulated by them, has the slightest support from the MSS. and the editions. The MSS. which I have collated for this purpose are mostly model Codices and represent all Schools, and different countries from the earliest date down to the invention of printing. There may be one or two MSS. in which this eccentric Dagesh has been introduced by some purist, but I have not been able to find it in a single one among the numerous Codices which I have collated. To introduce, therefore, such an innovation throughout the Hebrew Bible upon such slender evidence, if indeed it is to be called evidence at all, is a most unjustifiable defacing of the text.

The Dagesh is also inserted by Dr. Baer in consonants which follow a gutteral with silent Sheva. Delitzsch, who defends this innovation, declares that it is to be found in all good MSS. and hence lays down the following rule:

It is designed that the letter which is thus sharpened is to be pronounced emphatically. It begins a new syllable since the preceding gutteral is to be read with silent Sheva. The Dagesh warns us that it is not to be pronounced מַשְלֵּחֹה, מַשְלֵּחֹה, מַשְלֵחֹה, מַשְלֵחֹה, מַשְלֵחֹה, מַשְלֵחִה, מַשְלֵחְה, מַשְלֵּחִה, מַשְּלֵחְה, מַשְלֵחִיה, מַשְלֵחִיה, מַשְלֵחִיה, מַשְלֵחִיה, מַשְלֵחִיה, מַשְלֵחִיה, מַשְלֵחִיה, מַשְלֵּחִיה, מִשְלֵּחִיה, מַשְלֵּחִיה, מַשְּלֵחִיה, מַשְלֵּחִיה, מַשְלֵּחִיה, מַשְּלֵחִיה, מַשְלֵּחִיה, מַשְּלֵחִיה, מַשְּלֵּחִיה, מַשְּלֵּחִיה, מַשְּלֵּחִיה, מַשְּלֵּחִיה, מַשְּלֵּחִיה, מַשְּלֵּחִיה, מַשְּלֵחִיה, מַשְּלֵּחִיה, מִשְּלֵּחִיה, מִבְּיִּיּבְּיִיה, מַשְּלֵּחִיה, מַשְּלֵּחִיה, מִיבְּיִיּיִּיה, מִבְּיִּיּיִיה, מִיבְּיִּיּיִּיּיִיה, מִיבְּיִיּיִּיּיִיה, מַשְּלֵּחִיה, מִבְּיִיּיִיה, מִבְּיִייִּיּיה, מִיבְּיִייּיִיה, מִיבְּיִייּיִיה, מִיבְּייִיה, מִיבְּיִייּיִיה, מִיבְּיִייּיִיה, מִּיבְּיִייִיה, מִיבְּייִיה, מִיבְּייִייּיִיה, מִיבְּייִייּייִים, מִיבְּייִייּייִים, מִיבְּייִייּייִים, מִּיבְּייִייּייִים, מִּיבְּייִייּייִים, מִּבְּייִייּייִים, מִּיבְּייִייִּים, מִּיבְּייִיּייִים, מִּבְּייִייִים, מִּיבְּייִייּייִים, מִּיבְּייִים, מִיבְּייִים, מִּבְּייִים, מִּיִייִים, מִּבְייִים, מִּבְּייִים, מִּבְייִים, מִּבְייִים, מִיבְּייִים, מִבְּיִייִים, מִּבְייִים, מִבְייִים, מִבְּייִים, מִיבְּייים, מִבְּייִים, מִבְּייִים, מִיבְּייִים, מִבְייִים, מִבְּייִים, מִּיבְייִים, מִּבְייִים, מִיבְּייִים, מִיבְּייִים, מִיבְייִים, מִּבְייִים, מִּיבְייִים, מִיבְּייִים, מִיבְּייִים, מִּיבְייִים, מִּייִים, מִּייִּים, מִּייִּים, מִּיבְייִים, מִּייִים, מִּיבְּייים, מִּייִּים, מִּייִּים, מִּייִּים, מִּייִּים, מִּייִים, מִּיבְייִּים, מִּייִּים, מִּיבְייים, מִיבְּייִים, מִּיבְייִים, מִּיבְּיי

but which in the passages in question is not correct according to tradition. This Dagesh too, has been neglected in the current editions. Yet it is attested most emphatically by the Massorah which indicates it mostly by Dagesh (בושין) in those places where it ought to be, and by Raphe (בושין) where it ought not to be. Thus for instance on "וואס the Massorah has the following remark יואס it it occurs three times, once the Samech (D) has Dagesh, i. e. it does not begin a syllable, the syllable begins with the preceding gutteral בוֹי בְּיִבְּשִׁלֵּכְ (Gen. XLII 24) and twice it has Dagesh, i. e. it begins a syllable so that the gutteral by which it is preceded, has a silent Sheva בוֹי בְּיִבְּעִּכְּ (Gen. XLVI 29; Exod. XIV 6). To the same effect is the Massorah on מוֹסְבָּ (Joel IV 16; Ps. XLVI 2; LXII 29), but in the other instances it is הַּתְּבָּרָב (Joel IV 16; Ps. XLVI 2; LXII 29), but in the other instances it is הַּתְּבָּרָב (Toel IV 16; Ps. XLVI 2; LXII 29), but in the other instances it is הַּבְּרַבְּרָב (Toel IV 16; Ps. XLVI 2; LXII 29), but in the other instances it is הַבְּרַבְּרָב (Toel IV 16; Ps. XLVI 2; LXII 29), but in the other instances it is הַבְּרַבְּרָב (Toel IV 16; Ps. XLVI 2; LXII 29).

But this statement is based upon a misunderstanding of the expressions Dagesh and Raphe as used by the

- 1 Auch dieses Dagesch findet sich in allen guten Handschriften. Sein Absehen geht darauf, dass der Buchstabe, den es schärft, ausdruckvoll gesprochen werde; es beginnt ja eine neue Silbe, der vorhergehende Gutteral soll mit ruhendem Sch'ba gelesen werden; das Dagesch warnt, dass man nicht ausspreche — eine Aussprache, welche an sich statthaft, תַּעַלִּים aber in den betreffenden Stellen nicht die überlieferungsgemäss richtige ist. Auch dieses Dagesch ist in den gangbaren Druckausgaben vernachlässigt. Und doch hat es ausdrückliche Zeugnisse der Masora für sich. Diese zeigt es da. wo es stehen soll, meist mit דגש an, so wie sie da, wo es nicht stehen soll, רפי bemerkt. So macht sie z. B. zu ויאסר folgende Note: ג' חד רפי וב' דנשין, d. h. dreimal kommt יאסר vor; einmal ist das Samech nicht dagessirt, so dass also nicht mit ihm, sondern mit dem vorhergehenden Gutteral die neue Silbe anfängt (פור XLII 24), zweimal ist das Samech dagessirt, also silbeneröffnend, so dass also der vorstehende Gutteral ein einfaches ruhendes Sch'bâ hat האים Gen. XLVI 29, Exod. XIV 6). Ebenso bemerkt die Masora: מחסה ג' רפין ושאר דגשין, d. h. an drei Stellen ist מחסה zu lesen (nämlich Joel IV 16; Ps. XLVI 2; LXII 9), an den drei andern מַחְמָה.* Zeitschrift für die gesammte lutherische Theologie und Kirche, Vol. XXIV, pp. 413, 414, Leipzig 1863.
- * Siehe Heidenheim's Meor Enajim zu Gen. X 7 und die Zeitschrift Kerem Chemed, Jahrg. IV, S. 119. So wie oben erklärt ist hat man das masoretische DI und DI in diesen Fällen zu verstehen; Elias Levita in seinem Masoreth ha-masoreth (II 3. g. E.) weiss es nicht befriedigend zu erklären.

Massorah. Elias Levita, who is recognised as the highest Massoretic authority and who was not only a contemporary but a personal friend of Jacob b. Chayim the first compiler and editor of the Massorah, explains it that Dagesh in the terminology of the Massorah, denotes simple Sheva and that Raphe means Chateph-segol or Chateph-pathach. Accordingly when the Massorah says that אווי has Dagesh in two instances, it means that the Aleph has simple Sheva, i. e. is pointed ייא and that in the one instance where it is Raphe, the Aleph has Chateph-segol or is pointed ייא משטר has Dagesh in three instances, i. e. the letter Ayin has simple Sheva or is pointed מעשר to distinguish it from those places where it is Raphe or where the letter Ayin has Chateph-pathach, i. e. Turned. Levita's words are as follows:

I shall now return to my first subject and give you an example of a Sheva which the Massorites call Dagesh. They make the following remark in the Massorah: 'the expression עלמה to conceal has always Dagesh,' that is, it is always with simple Sheva, as העלם יעלימו hiding they shall hide (Levit. XX 4) &c. They also say that the word השום to trust has always Dagesh, as always Dagesh, is shall trust (Ps. LVII 2), my shelter (Ps. XCI 2) &c., except in eight instances where it is Raphe, that is with Chateph-pathach or Chateph-segol, as מוֹם refuge (Joel IV 16), אוֹם אוֹם ווֹם trust (Ps. XVIII 3). They also remark that מעשר tithe occurs three times with Dagesh, as אוֹם the tithe of (Levit. XXVII 30) &c., whilst in all other instances it is Raphe, that is with Chateph-pathach, as אוֹם the tithe of (Deut. XIV 23) &c.¹

This definition by the first and foremost expositor of the terminology of the Massorah, it is almost needless to

והנה חוזר על הראשונות ואתן לך משל על השוא שקראו דנש: אמרו במסורת בל לשון העלמה ברגש, ר"ל בשוא פשוט, כמו ואם העלם ועלימו ודומיהן: וכן כל לשון העלמה ברגש, ר"ל בשוא פשוט, מו ומיי מַהְסי ודומיהן: חוץ מן ח' רפויין, לשון חסיה דגש, כמו בצל בנפיך אֶחְסה, אומר לי"י מַהְסה לעמו, צורי אֶחְסה בי: וכן אמרי ר"ל בחטף פתח או בחטף סגול, כמו וי"י מַהְסה לעמו, צורי אֶחֶסה בי: וכן אמרי מעשר ג' דגושים, כמו מַעְשר הארץ וכולי, וכל שאר רפויים, ר"ל בחטף פתח במי נידיק והמצא עיר. Comp. Massoreth Ha-Massoreth, pp. 203, 204 ed. Ginsburg.

124 Introduc

say, is in perfect harmony with the orthography of the most correct MSS., and with all the early editions. It was Heidenheim who, in his edition of the Pentateuch entitled Meor Enayim (Rödelheim 1818—21), maintained that the expression Dagesh in these instances denotes the visible dot which is put in the letter following the silent Sheva, and that Raphe means the absence of this dot in the letter following the Chateph-pathach or Chateph-segol. "It is the Mem," he says on דעמה in Gen. X 7, "which has the Dagesh to show that the Sheva which precedes it is simple, i. e. דעמה and not like בעמה with Chateph-pathach and with Mem Raphe." 1

That Levita's explanation is the correct one and that the sense assigned to these Massoretic expressions by Heidenheim, Delitzsch and Dr. Baer is contrary to the best MSS. will be evident from an examination of the seven examples which these expositors have adduced to prove their theory. To facilitate reference I shall again arrange these passages in the order of the Hebrew Bible.

I. The first passage which Heidenheim quotes and on which, as we have seen, he formulates this rule is רעמה Gen. X 7. This proper name he points רעמה. Dr. Baer, who follows Heidenheim and also points it with Dagesh in the Mem, did not even deem it necessary to make any remark in the Notes, forming the Appendix to Genesis that there is any variation here in the MSS. or in the early editions. As this expression occurs six times, five times as a proper name (Gen. X 7 twice; Ezek. XXVII 22; I Chron. I 9 twice), and once denoting thunder (Job XXXIX 19), Dr. Baer points it with Dagesh in the Mem

י או"ה דגשות המ"ם להורות על השוא שלפניו שהוא פשוט ואיננו כמו נַעֲמָה בח"פ והמ"ם רפה, וכן מדרך בעל המסרה למסור על כגון אלה דגש ורפה וכמוהו לקמן בפ' ויגש על וַיָּאָפֹר יוסף מרכבתו נמסר כולהון דגושין במ"א רפה וַיָּאָאֲסֹר אות: לעיניה'.

in every instance, and in no case does he mention in the Appendices to the several parts that there exists a difference in the pointing of this word. This, being a test instance, I shall give in detail both the MSS. and the early editions, respecting its orthography.

In the passage before us there are two different orthographies of this expression. The majority of the MSS. and the early editions which I have collated point it with Sheva under the Ayin and without Dagesh in the Mcm. This is the case in Orient. 4445, which is the oldest Codex extant; in Orient. 2201, which is dated A. D. 1246; Add. 9401—9402, dated A. D. 1286; Harley 5710—11: Harley 1528; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Orient. 2348; Orient. 2349; Orient. 2350; Orient. 2365; Orient. 2620—28; the first edition of the entire Hebrew Bible, Soncino 1488; the Lisbon edition of the Pentateuch 1491; the second edition of the Bible, Naples 1491—93; the third edition of the Bible, Brescia 1494; the Complutensian Polyglot; Felix Pratensis' edition of the Rabbinic Bible 1517: and the quarto edition, Venice 1521.

The second way in which this expression is pointed, is הַנְּעָקָה with Chateph-pathach under the Ayin. This is the case in Arund. Orient. 2, which is dated A. D. 1216: in Add. 15250; Orient. 4227 and in the first edition of the Pentateuch, Bologna 1482. The only MS. which points it הַנְעָשָה with Dagesh in the Mem, as far as my collation extended, is Add. 15451, but even this MS. points it הַעָּשָה without the Dagesh in the second instance of this very verse. It is probably owing to this MS. or to one like it, that Jacob b. Chayim appended in the margin במ דני But this is the first and the only one of the early editions which has adopted this orthography. The most remarkable fact, however, in connection with the orthography of this

expression, has still to be stated. Heidenheim in his edition of the Ayin Ha-Korē gives וַרְעָמָה with Dagesh in the Mem as the pointing of Yekuthiel, whereas in the two MSS. of this Nakdan in the British Museum, one, viz. Orient. 19776, has it וועמה with Chateph-pathach under the Ayin, whilst Orient 856 points it ווֹעְמָה without Dagesh in the Mem, thus exhibiting the two-fold orthography which is to be found in almost all the MSS. and the early editions. And yet this is the very passage in Yekuthiel upon which Heidenheim reared his fabric.

The second instance in which this proper name occurs, is in the latter half of this very verse, viz. Gen. X 7. Here too the MSS. and the early editions exhibit two kinds of orthography. The larger majority of MSS. and editions point it רַעמַה with Sheva under the Ayin and without Dagesh in the Mem. This is the case in Orient. 4445; Orient. 2201; Add. 9401-9402; Harley 5710-11; Harley 1528; Yekuthiel Orient. 853; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Orient. 2348; Orient. 2349; Orient. 2350; Orient. 2365 and Orient. 2626—28 as well as all the above named early editions. The MSS. which exhibit דְּעָהָה, the second kind of orthography, are Arund. Orient. 2, dated A. D. 1216; Yekuthiel in Orient. 19776; Add. 15250; Orient. 4227 and the first edition of the Pentateuch, Bologna 1482. It is remarkable that Add. 15451, which, as we have seen, is the only MS. representing וַרַעמַה with Dagesh in the Mem, has here רַעְמָה without Dagesh, so that the first Rabbinic Bible with the Massorah by Jacob b. Chayim is the solitary early edition which has רַעמה with Dagesh.

The third instance in which this proper name occurs, is Ezek. XXVII 22. Here all the MSS. with one exception and all the editions also with one exception have יוֹלְטָלָה without Dagesh in the Mem. This is the case in Orient. 2201; Harley 5710—11: Arund. Orient. 16; Add. 15451;

Harley 1528; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Orient. 2626-28; the second edition of the Bible, Naples 1491-93; the Latter Prophets, Pesaro 1515; the fourth edition of the Bible, Pesaro 1511-1517; the Complutensian Polyglot; the first edition of the Rabbinic Bible by Felix Pratensis 1517; the Venice quarto edition 1521 and the first edition of Jacob b. Chayim's Rabbinic Bible with the Massorah, Venice 1524-25. The only edition which exhibits וַרְעַמֵּה the second kind of orthography is that of Brescia 1494, whilst there is one solitary MS. in the British Museum which has וַרְעָמֵה with Dagesh in the Mem, viz. Orient. 4227. The remarkable fact in connection with this instance is that both, Add. 15451 and the first edition of Jacob b. Chayim's Bible with the Massorah which represent this orthography in Gen. X 7, have in the passage before us וְרַעְמָה without Dagesh in the Mem.

The fourth passage in which this expression occurs, but where it is not a proper name, is Job XXXIX 19. All the MSS, with one exception exhibit the first orthography, viz. רַעְמָה with Sheva under the Ayin and Mem without Dagesh. So Orient. 2201; Harley 5710-11; Arund. Orient. 16; Or. 2091; Harley 1528; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Orient. 2212; Orient. 2626—28; the first edition of the Hagiographa, Naples 1486-87; the second edition of the Bible, Naples 1491-93; the third edition of the Bible, Brescia 1494; the Psalms, Proverbs, Job &c., Salonica 1515; the Complutensian Polyglot; the Rabbinic Bible by Felix Pratensis 1517; the quarto Bible, Venice 1521; and Jacob b. Chayim's first edition of the Bible with the Massorah וובעמה the second orthography with Chateph-pathach under the Ayin is exhibited in Orient. 4227; in the first edition of the Bible, Soncino 1488; and in the fourth edition, Pesaro 1511-17. From the above analysis it will be seen that not one of the MSS. which I have

collated, nor any of the early editions have אַנְשָׁהְ with Dagesh in the Mem.

The fifth passage where this expression occurs, but where it is again a proper name, is in I Chron. I 9. As is the case in the other instances the MSS, and editions have here the two-fold orthography, but as they also exhibit a variant in the spelling, it will be best to discuss the authorities under the different forms in which it is written.

The first form of this name in the earlier part of the verses is with Aleph at the end, and Sheva under the Ayin without Dagesh in the Mem. This is the case in Orient. 2201; Arund. Orient. 16; Harley 1528; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; the second edition of the Bible, Naples 1491—93; the Complutensian Polyglot; and the first edition of the Rabbinic Bible with the Massorah by Jacob b. Chayim 1524—25. The same form with Aleph, but exhibiting the second orthography, viz. אוריים with Cateph-pathach under the Ayin, is to be found in Add. 15252; and in Orient. 4227, but in none of the early editions.

The variant or the second form of this name is אול דעמה with He at the end. This also exhibits the two-fold orthography. Thus אול שול with Sheva under the Ayin, but without the Dagesh in the Mem, is the reading in Harley 5710–11; Orient. 2091; Orient. 2212; the first edition of the Hagiographa, Naples 1486–87; the first edition of the Bible, Soncino 1488; the first edition of the Rabbinic Bible by Felix Pratensis 1517; and the quarto Bible, Venice 1521, whilst אול ווי ל the second orthography with Chateph-pathach under the Ayin is the reading of the third and fourth editions of the Bible, Brescia 1494 and Pesaro 1511—17. It will thus be seen that אול בין סיי שול שול Dagesh in the Mem is not the reading in any of the MSS. or editions.

We now come to the sixth or last instance of this expression which occurs in the latter part of the same verse, i. e. 1 Chron. I 9. As the MSS. and editions also exhibit here a variant in the spelling, I shall separate the two different forms. The form which has the greatest MS. authority, is רעמה with He at the end. But like its fellow in the other passages, it has been transmitted in a two-fold orthography. The one best attested is דְּעָמֵה with Sheva under the Ayin, He at the end and no Dagesh in the Mem. This is the reading in Orient. 2201; Harley 5710-11; Arund. Orient. 16; Orient. 2091; Harley 1528; Add. 15252; Add. 15451; Orient. 2212; Orient. 2626—28; the Complutensian Polyglot; the first Rabbinic Bible by Felix Pratensis 1517; the Venice quarto 1521; and the first Rabbinic Bible with the Massorah by Jacob b. Chayim 1524-25. The same spelling, but with Chateph-pathach under the Ayin, i. e. וֹעמה is also exhibited in Orient. 4227; the first, third and fourth editions of the Bible, Soncino 1488, Brescia 1494 and Pesaro בּעמא with Aleph at the end, but this too has no Dagesh in the Mem and is to be found in Add. 15250; Add. 15251; in the first edition of the Hagiographa, Naples 1486-87; and in the second edition of the Bible, Naples 1491-93. Here too, therefore, ס רעמה or יעמא with Dagesh in the Mem is not the reading in any of the MSS. or early editions. But what is most remarkable in connection with this orthography, is the fact that the only MS. which points it with Dagesh in the Mem in Gen. X 7 and the only early edition which exhibits the same phenomenon, viz. Add. 15451 and the first edition of Jacob b. Chayim's Rabbinic Bible, have it here without Dagesh in the Mem in both parts of the verse, though 1 Chron. I 9 is a duplicate of Gen. X 7.

The result, therefore, of the above analysis of the six instances in which this expression occurs, is as follows.

In the first passage only one MS. and one edition have the Dagesh. In the second passage, which is the second clause of the same verse, the same single edition has it, but no MS., not even the one which exhibits it in the first clause. In the third passage only one MS. has it, but not a single edition, whilst in the fourth, fifth and sixth passages it is not to be found in any MS. or early edition. II. Gen. XLVI 29.

ויאסר with Dagesh, Add. 9401; Add. 15451; Orient. 4227. ויאָסֹר without Dagesh, Orient. 4445, which is the oldest

MS. extant; Arund. Orient. 2, dated A. D. 1216;

Orient. 2201, dated A. D 1246; Harley 5710-11; Harley 1528; Add. 21160; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Orient. 2348; Orient. 2349; Orient. 2350; Orient. 2365; Orient. 2451; Orient. 2626-28; the first edition of the Pentateuch, Bologna 1482; the second edition of the Bible, Naples 1491-93; the Complutensian Polyglot; the first edition of the Rabbinic Bible by Felix Pratensis 1517; the quarto Bible, Venice 1521; and the first edition of the Bible with the Massorah by Jacob b. Chayim 1524-25. The orthography ויאסר with Chateph-segol under the Aleph is exhibited in the first edition of the Bible, Soncino 1488; in the Lisbon Pentateuch 1491; and in the third edition of the Bible, Brescia 1494. Exod. XIV 6.

ויאסר with Dagesh, Add. 9401; Harley 5710—11; Add. 15451.

ויאסר without Dagesh, Orient. 4445; Arund. Orient. 2; Orient. 2201; Harley 1528; Add. 21160; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Orient. 4227; Orient. 2328; Orient. 2329; Orient. 2350; Orient. 2365; Orient. 2451; Orient. 2626—28; the first edition of the Pentateuch,

Bologna 1482; the Lisbon edition 1491; the second edition of the Bible, Naples 1491—93; the Complutensian Polyglot; the first edition of the Rabbinic Bible by Felix Pratensis 1517; the quarto Bible, Venice 1521; and the first edition of the Bible with the Massorah by Jacob b. Chayim 1524—25. TIMENT WITH Chateph-segol is exhibited in Add. 15250, and in the first and third editions of the Bible, Soncino 1488 and Brescia 1494.

In analysing the different MSS. on this word in the foregoing two passages the following facts are disclosed: (1) Orient. 4227, which has Dagesh in the Samech in Gen. XLVI 29, has no Dagesh in Exod. XIV 6; (2) Harley 5710-11, which has no Dagesh in Gen. XLVI 29, but which has Dagesh in the text in Exod. XIV 6, is corrected in the Massorah Parva with the remark ג' רפי׳ בקרי׳, i. e. in three instances it is Raphe in the Bible which either means that it is one of the three passages where it is ויאָסר with Chateph-segol or ויאָסר with Sheva under the Aleph and without Dagesh in the Samech; and (3) Orient. 2348; Orient. 2349; Orient. 2350; and Orient, 2365, which have the following Massorah against it כל לשו' חבישה לא מפיק אלף, show beyond doubt that the Massorah on this word, whether it is רבי or רבי, refers to the Aleph and not to the Samech.

III. Levit. XX 4.

העלם יעלימו with Dagesh, Add. 9401, Add. 15451.

העלם יעלימי without Dagesh, Orient. 4445; Orient. 2201; Harley 5710—11; Harley 1528; Add. 21160; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Orient. 4227; Orient. 2348; Orient. 2349; Orient. 2350; Orient. 2365; Orient. 2451; Orient. 2626—28; the first edition of the Pentateuch,

Bologna 1482; the first edition of the Bible, Soncino 1488; the Lisbon Pentateuch 1491; the second and third editions of the Bible, Naples 1491-93, Brescia 1494; the Complutensian Polyglot; the first Rabbinic Bible by Felix Pratentis 1517; the quarto Bible, Venice 1521; and the first edition of the Bible with the Massorah by Jacob b. Chayim 1524-25. with Chateph-pathach under the Ayin is the reading in Arund. Orient. 2, which is dated A. D. 1216, and Add. 15250.

IV. Psalm X 1.

תעלים with Dagesh, Add. 15451; the first and third editions of the Bible, Soncino 1488, Brescia 1494. תעלים without Dagesh, Orient. 2201; Arund. Orient. 16; Harley 5710-11; Harley 1528; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Orient. 2091; Orient. 2626-28; Orient. 2212; the first edition of the Hagiographa, Naples 1486-87; the second edition of the Bible, Naples 1491-93; the fourth edition, Pesaro 1511-17; Psalms, Proverbs &c., Salonica 1515; Complutensian Polyglot; the first Rabbinic Bible by Felix Pratensis 1517; the quarto Bible, Venice 1521; and the first edition of the Bible with the Massorah by Jacob b. Chayim 1524-25. תעלים with Chateph-pathach under the Ayin, is the reading in Orient. 4227.

V. Psalm XXXIV 1.

שעם with Dagesh, Add. 15451.

שעמו without Dagesh, Orient. 2201; Arund. Orient. 16; Harley 5710-11; Harley 1528; Orient. 2091; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Orient. 2212; Orient. 2626-28; the first edition of the Hagiographa, Naples 1486-87; the Psalms, Proverbs &c., Salonica 1515; the Complutensian Polyglot; the first edition of the Rabbinic Bible by Felix Pratensis 1517; the quarto Bible, Venice 1521; and the first edition of the Bible with the Massorah by Jacob b. Chayim 1524-25. With Chateph-pathach under the Ayin is the reading in Orient. 4227; the first, second, third and fourth editions of the Bible, Soncino 1488, Naples 1491-93, Brescia 1494, and Pesaro 1511-17.

VI. Psalm LXI 4.

מחְסָה with Dagesh, Add. 15451.

מחסה without Dagesh, Orient. 2201; Harley 5710—11; Harley 1528; Orient. 2001; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Orient. 2212; Orient. 2626-28; the first edition of the Hagiographa, Naples 1486-87; the first edition of the Bible, Soncino 1488; the second edition, Naples 1491-93; the third edition, Brescia 1494; the fourth edition, Pesaro 1511-17; the Psalms, Proverbs &c., Salonica 1515; the Complutensian Polyglot; the first edition of the Rabbinic Bible by Felix Pratensis 1517; the quarto Bible, Venice 1521; and the first edition of the Bible with the Massorah by Jacob b. Chayim 1524—25. The reading שולם with Chateph-pathach under the Cheth is that of Arund. Orient. 16 and Orient. 4227. The former has the Massorah against it רפיי בלישי eight times with Chateph-pathach in this form. I have, therefore, adopted it in my edition.

VII. Psalm CV 22.

לאסר with Dagesh, Add. 15451; Orient. 2091.

אלסר without Dagesh, Orient. 2201; Arund. Orient. 16; Harley 5710—11; Harley 1528; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Orient. 4227; Orient. 2212; Orient. 2626—28; the first, second, third and fourth editions

of the Bible, Soncino 1488, Naples 1491-93, Brescia 1494, Pesaro 1511—17; the Psalms, Proverbs &c., Salonica 1515; the Complutensian Polyglot; the first Rabbinic Bible by Felix Pratensis 1517; the quarto Bible, Venice 1521; and the first edition of the Bible with the Massorah by Jacob b. Chayim 1524-25. The reading לאסר with Chateph-segol is exhibited in the first edition of the Hagiographa, Naples 1486-87.

VIII. Psalm CIX 29.

ויעטו with Dagesh.

ויעשו with Chateph-pathach, Orient. 2201; Arund. Orient. 16; Harley 5710—11; Harley 1528; Add. 21161; Add. 15451; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Orient. 4227; Orient. 2091; Orient. 2212; Orient. 2626-28; the first edition of the Hagiographa, Naples 1486-87; the first, second and third editions of the Bible, Soncino 1488, Naples 1491-93, and Brescia 1494; the Psalms, Proverbs &c., Salonica 1515; the Complutensian Polyglot; the edition of the Rabbinic Bible by Felix Pratensis 1517; the quarto Bible, Venice 1521; and the first edition of the Bible with the Massorah by Jacob b. Chayim 1524-25.

These are the instances adduced by Heidenheim and Delitzsch to establish their rule that the consonant which follows a gutteral with Sheva is invariably with Dagesh. The passages in which רַעָּמָה occurs marked No. I, I have already analysed. Though No. II has the support of three MSS., the most ancient and by far the larger number are against this eccentric Dagesh. Amongst these are Standard Codices of exceptional accuracy. Moreover all the early editions, which Delitzsch himself describes as having the same value as MSS., are against its presence. Equally so is No. III which is exhibited in two MSS., but which is opposed to the oldest and Standard Codices as well as to all the early editions. No. IV, which is found in only one MS., is supported by two editions, but is against the large majority of Codices and early editions. Nos. V and VI have only one MS. in their favour and no early edition at all. No. VII, which is supported by two MSS., has not only all the Standard Codices against it, but all the early editions, whilst No. VIII is a false reading, since I could not find it in any MS. or early edition.

Levita's explanation, therefore, of the Massoretic use of the terms Dagesh and Raphe is fully borne out by the larger number of MSS., amongst which are the oldest and Standard Codices. Hence, Delitzsch's declaration, that the Dagesh in the consonant after a gutteral with Sheva is to be found in all the best MSS., is based upon wrong information for which, as the article in question shows, Dr. Baer is responsible. To introduce, therefore, this eccentric Dagesh throughout the Hebrew Bible, as has been done by Dr. Baer, is a most unjustifiable innovation. The only thing which can legitimately be done with the evidence of the MSS. and early editions before us, is to mention the fact that some mediaeval purists have inserted it in several places.

Far less objectionable is the third category of words in behalf of which Delitzsch in the same article pleads for the Dagesh and into which Dr. Baer has actually inserted it throughout the Bible in accordance with the rule laid down by Ben Balaam and Moses the Nakdan that when the two labials Beth Mem (22) follow each other at the beginning of a word the Beth, when it has Sheva, has Dagesh though it is preceded by one of the vowel-letters אוה And though Joseph Kimchi who, in expanding this rule, enforced it by the solemn declaration that whose reads

נבקלי (Gen. XXXII בון) Raphe, has not the spirit of the true grammarian in him,1 yet the grammarian Heidenheim deliberately points it so in his edition of the Pentateuch where he himself first called attention to this rule. Dr. Baer who, as a rule, follows Heidenheim most slavishly, has indeed in this instance departed from his great exemplar, reverted to the statement of Kimchi and accordingly points it במקלי with Dagesh. This, however, is against the celebrated Codex Hilali and against numerous Codices as well as against all the early editions, as will be seen from the following enumeration: Orient. 4445; Orient. 2201; Harley 2201; Add. 15251; Orient. 2348; Orient. 2349; Orient. 2350; Orient. 2365; and Orient. 2626-28. In all these MSS. the Beth has the Raphe stroke over it (5) so that there can be no mistake about it. It is also Raphe in the first edition of the Pentateuch, Bologna 1482; in the first edition of the Bible, Soncino 1488; in the second edition, Naples 1491-93; in the third edition, Brescia 1494; the Complutensian Polyglot; the first edition of the Rabbinic Bible by Felix Pratensis 1517; the quarto Bible, Venice 1521; and the first edition of the Bible with the Massorah by Jacob b. Chayim 1524-25.

The other instances which come under this rule and which Dr. Baer has invariably dageshed are treated in a similar manner in the MSS. and early editions. As I have, however, generally indicated the variations in their proper places, it is not necessary to discuss them here.

⁽Gen.XXXII II) אם הראשונה בי״ת ואחריה מי״ם הבי״ת רגושה כמי כי בְּמְקְלִי (Gen.XXXII II) אם הראשונה בי״ת ואחריה מי״ם בעלי הלשון המהקדקים נוחה הימנו. שהרי בי״ת רפויה והקורא איתה רפויה ו״ו ושואית לפני איתיות במ״ף אבל נשתנה למלאפום: דומה להברת ו״ו ולעולם לא תהיה ו״ו שואית לפני איתיות במ״ף אבל נשתנה למלאפום: Comp. Dr. Baer, Appendix to the Psalms, p. 92.

Chap. II.

The Orthography.

Without going the full length of those who maintain that the Hebrew Codex, from which the Septuagint was made, had no matres lectiones at all, it is now established beyond a doubt that the letters are commonly called quiescent or feeble letters, have been gradually introduced into the Hebrew text. It is, moreover, perfectly certain that the presence or absence of these letters in our text in many instances is entirely due to the idiosyncracy of the Scribes.

This is by no means the result of modern philology. Jehudah Chayug, who flourished circa A. D. 1010—1040 and who is described as the founder of Hebrew Grammar, already states that the insertion or omission of the *matres lectiones* has always been left to the discretion of the scribes, and that this practice still obtained in his days.³

Still more emphatic is the declaration of Ibn Ezra (1093-1167). He assures us that the choice of plenes and defectives was entirely left to the judgment of individual copyists, that some scribes wrote certain words plene

¹ Comp. Lagarde: Anmerkungen zur griechischen Uebersetzung der Proverbien, p. 4, Leipzig 1863.

² Comp. Chwolson: Die Quiescentes in der althebräischen Orthographie in the third International Congress of Orientalists, Vol. II, pp. 459, 474 and 478, St. Petersburg 1876.

³ Comp. Jehudah Chayug's Grammatical works edited by Leopold Dukes in the Beiträge zur Geschichte der Aeltesten Auslegung und Spracherklärung des Alten Testamentes von Ewald und Dukes, Vol. III, p. 22, Stuttgart 1844.

when in their opinion the text ought to be made a little clearer, and that others wrote the same words defective when they wanted to economise space. His words are as follows:

The sages of the Massorah evolved from their inner consciousness reasons why some words are plene and some defective which, however, only serves to satisfy the ignorant who seek reasons for the plenes and defectives. Behold the scribe could not do otherwise than write plene when he wanted to preclude the word from being mistaken for its homonym as for instance Duy, 1 or defective when he wanted to be shorter.2

The following examples will suffice to illustrate this fact.

N. — The Massorah itself has catalogued various Lists of words in which Aleph is still wanting. From these Lists, which I have printed in the Massorah³ I extract a few instances exhibiting words in their original form.

"I have found" (Numb. XI 11) the only instance of the preterite first person which has survived without Aleph. In all the other 39 passages in which it occurs this radical letter has uniformly been inserted.

יְּצְהִי "I came out" (Job I 21) which has not only Aleph inserted in the only other place where it occurs in this very book (Job III 11), but also in all the other five instances where it is to be found in the Hebrew Bible.4

יְּבְּלְתִי "I am full" (Job XXXII 18) which has Aleph inserted in the other two instances where it occurs (Jerem. VI 11; Micah III 8).

י That is עוֹלֶם is plene and not עלם defective which might be mistaken for אָלָם, עָלָם, עָלָם or עֵילָם בעַלָם.

² וחכמי המסרת בראו מלבם מעמים למלא" ולחסרי", והם מובים למלא כל חסר לב. כי אחרי שהם מבקשים מעם למלא ולחסר, הנה אין כח בסופר לכתוב רק מלא אם רצה לבאר שלא תתערב המלה כמו עולם, או יכתוב חסר לאחוז דרך קצרה: "tippman, Fürth 1839.

³ Comp. The Massorah, letter ℵ, §§ 14-18, Vol. I, pp. 9-12.

⁴ Comp. Numb. XXII 32; Jerem. XIV 18; XX 18; Prov. VII 15; Dan. IX 22.

וֹחָלְּחֵ "and she laid hold" (2 Sam. XX 9) in which the Aleph has been inserted in the only other passage where this form is to be found (Ruth III 15).

אָלָתְיּ "thy petition" (I Sam. I 17). Here too the Aleph has been introduced in the other three places where this form occurs (Esther V 6; VII 2; IX 12).

Still more striking is the case where the same phrase occurs twice in the same book, once exhibiting the primitive form without *Aleph*, and once with *Aleph* inserted.

Thus for instance Gen. XXV 24 "and behold מוֹמָם twins in her womb" without Aleph, and Gen. XXXVIII 27 "and behold מאוֹמִים twins in her womb" with Aleph.

Jeremiah VIII וו "and they have healed וַיְרַפּוּ the hurt" without Aleph at the end of the word, and Jeremiah VI וון "and they have healed וְיַרְפָּאוּ the hurt" with Aleph at the end of the word.

David's Hymn of Triumph which is recorded in duplicate, once in 2 Sam. XXII and once in Psalm XVIII, affords a striking illustration of this fact. In the former the phrase "for thou hast girded me" with strength for the battle" (2 Sam. XXII 40) exhibits the primitive form without Aleph, whilst in the latter "for thou hast girded me is already the insertion of the Aleph.

In the list of David's heroes, of which we have also a duplicate, one in 2 Samuel XXIII, and one in Chronicles XI, Nahari the Beerothite is mentioned. In the one place it is the Berothite without Aleph (1 Chron. XI 39), whilst in other it is תַּבְּאַרְתִי the Berothite (2 Sam. XXIII 37) with Aleph already inserted.

The examples of the absence of *Aleph* which are duly noticed by the Massorah are of a still more instructive character when we consider the following instances:

בנד in Gen. XXX וו is according to the Massorah בָּלְּ a troop cometh. It will be seen that not only are the two words written continuously, but that in separating them Aleph has to be inserted by the direction of the Massorah.

The same is the case in Psalm CXXXIX 20 where the Westerns read ימרוך without Aleph, and the Easterns read ימרוך with Aleph.

These typical illustrations suffice to show that the primitive forms have not all been superseded by the fuller mode of spelling.

Many other instances of the absence of Aleph occur throughout the text which have partially been obscured by the Punctuators, who, by not recognising this fact have so pointed the words in question as to assign them to different roots. By a careful use of the ancient Versions, however, which were made prior to the introduction of the vowel-signs we are not unfrequently able to ascertain the primitive orthography, as will be seen from the following illustrations:

In Gen. IV 15 the text from which the Septuagint was made had לבן (without Aleph) = לבן "not so" and this

reading is supported by the context. Cain tells God in the preceding verse that as a fugitive his life was in danger, and that any one who chances to meet him will slay him. Hereupon the Lord assures him in the verse before us that this shall not be the case. Accordingly the correct reading of the verse is: "And the Lord said unto him, it shall not be so (א כי) whosoever &c."

In 2 Kings VII 17 we have the primitive form אָרָה בּיִר בּיִּר בְּיִּר בְּיִר "the messenger" without Aleph as is attested by the Septuagint and the Syriac. The passage ought accordingly to be translated "when the messenger came down to him". This is corroborated by the statement in the preceding chapter, viz. VI 33 Exactly the reverse is the case in 2 Sam. XI 1 where the Massorah itself tells us that the redactors of the text inserted Aleph into this very word, converting (הַּמֵּלְבִים) "kings" into (הַמֵּלְבִים) "messengers".

Ps. XXXIII 7 the Septuagint translates "He gathered the waters of the sea together as in a bottle" בְּנֹך = כנר. This form, which occurs in Ps. CXIX 83 with Aleph, was manifestly written here without Aleph, but was originally pronounced in the same way, as is also attested by the Chaldee and the Syriac as well as by the parallelism. The Massorites, however, who supposed that there is a reference here to the passage of the Red Sea (Exod. XV 8) pointed it and thus obscured its etymology.

According to the testimony of the Septuagint and the Syriac, לשרך in Proverbs III 8 ought to be pointed and the word in question exhibits the primitive form without the Aleph. The passage, therefore, ought to be translated:

"It shall be health to thy body And marrow to thy bones."

This reading which restores the parallelism is now adopted by most critics.

142

In the process of supplying the *Aleph*, however, the redactors of the text have not unfrequently inserted it where the Massorites themselves tell us, it is superfluous. Hence the Massorah has preserved different Lists of sundry expressions, in which, by the direction of the Massorites the *Aleph* is to be cancelled.¹

Thus for instance they state that אולספון which occurs twice in Exodus, viz. V 7 and IX 28 has in the first passage a superfluous Aleph, and this is corroborated by the fact that in the only other two places where this form occurs (Gen. XLIV 23; Deut. XVII 16) it has no Aleph.

The same is the case in 2 Sam. XI 24 ייראוּ המוראים "and the shooters shot" where the Aleph, according to the Massorah, has superfluously been inserted in both words, and this is confirmed by a reference to 2 Chronicles XXXV 23, where this phrase occurs again without the Aleph.

These again must be taken as simply typical instances. Other examples may easily be gathered from the ancient Versions of which the following is a striking illustration, where Aleph has been inserted in בצואר rock making it neck Ps. LXXV 6. The Septuagint exhibits the primitive form without the Aleph and the passage ought accordingly to be translated:

"Do not exalt your horn toward heaven Nor speak arrogantly of the Rock."

א and \mathfrak{v} . — The same vicissitudes to which the feeble Aleph was subject, are also traceable in the soft Ayin. Very frequently it was not expressed in the primitive forms. This orthography is still exhibited in the name בּעָל Bel = 5 Bel

¹ Comp. The Massorah, letter N, §§ 17, 18, Vol. I, pp. 11, 12.

Massorah itself tells us that ונשקה (Amos VIII 8) stands for ונשקעה.

According to the testimony of the ancient Versions, in Ps. XXVIII 8, is the primitive form of int, "to His people". This is attested by the Septuagint, the Syriac and the Vulgate as well as by several MSS., and the parallel passage in Ps. XXIX II. Accordingly the verse is to be translated:

"Jehovah is strength to His people

And He is the saving strength to His anointed."

And it is now admitted by the best critics that בכו in Micah I 10 stands for בָּבוֹ the maritime city in the territory of Asher (Comp. Judg. I 31). Accordingly Micah I 10 reads:

"Declare it not at Gath

Weep not at Accho

In the house of Aphrah roll thyself in the dust."

This explains the otherwise inexplicable passage in Hosea VII 6. Here ישן simply exhibits the primitive orthography, יְשָׁיֶן = יְשׁיֵן, and אַפֿהם is to be pointed אַפֿהם as is attested by the Chaldee and the Syriac. Accordingly the passage is to be translated:

"their anger smoketh all night." 1

This not only relieves the verse, but agrees with the context and parallelism.

Owing to their similarity in pronunciation and most probably also to the similarity of their form in ancient times? the redactors of the text, in supplying these two

Comp. Deut. XXIX 19 and W. Robertson Smith in the *Journal of Philology*. Vol. XVI, p. 72, London and Cambridge 1888.

² That the א and צ like the ב and ב the and מ &c. must have been similar in form in olden times is evident form the following caution given in the Talmud to the Scribes ביתין כפין כפין כפין כיינין עיינין עיינין אלפין. ביתין כפין כפין כפין כיינין עיינין עיינין אלפין. ביתין כיינין כיינין ביתין ניינין ביתין ניינין אלפין ביתין ניינין ביתין ניינין ביתין ניינין ביתין ניינין ביתין ניינין ניינין ניינין עיינין אלפין ביתין ניינין אלפין ביתין ניינין ניינין ניינין אלפין ביתין ניינין ניינין ניינין ניינין ניינין אלפין ביתין ניינין ניינין ניינין ניינין אלפין ניינין ניינין אלפין ניינין ניינין אלפין ביתין ניינין ניינין אלפין ניינין ניינין אלפין ביתין ניינין אלפין ניינין ניינין ניינין אלפין ניינין ניינין אלפין ניינין ניינין אלפין ביתין ניינין ניינין ניינין עיינין אלפין ביתין ניינין ניינין ניינין אלפין ניינין אלפין ביתים ביתין ניינין ניינין עיינין אלפין ביתים ביתים ביתים ביתין ניינין ניינין עיינין אלפין ביתים
letters, have not unfrequently interchanged them. Hence we have אָנָעָל to be rejected as polluted with Ayin in 2 Sam. I 21, and נגאל with Aleph in Zeph. III 1.

מְתְעֵב despised with Ayin Isa. XLIX 7, and מָתְאַב with Aleph Amos VI 8.

In Ps. LXXVI 8 it is או אפיך the power of thinc anger, and Ps. XC או אפיך.

Hosea VII 6 בארבם is now regarded by some of the best critics to stand for בער בם, whilst קרשו Ps. XXXV וז, whilst אַרָר Ps. XXXV אַר בּטּ is taken for קרשו "they cry out". Professor Cheyne, who adopts this rendering, did not even deem it necessary to notice the fact that it is with Ayin in the Massoretic text, and that without this interchange of letters it denotes to rend asunder. The Massorah has preserved sundry Lists of words in which Aleph stands for Ayin and vice versa. 1

7. — The greatest peculiarities exhibited in the orthography of the Hebrew text are connected with the letter He. The Massorah catalogues a number of Lists of words which ought to have He at the beginning; and vice versa, of words which have a superfluous He, and which, according to the Massorah ought to be cancelled; words which want He in the middle, and vice versa, words which have a superfluous He in the middle, as well as of words which have a superfluous He in the end, and which the Massorites condemn.

Of great orthographical and lexical importance, moreover, are the Lists containing sundry words throughout the Hebrew Scriptures, in which this letter is interchanged

¹ Comp. The Massorah, letter N, § 514, Vol. I, p. 57; letter V, §§ 352, 360 &c.; Vol. II, p. 390.

² Comp. The Massorah, letter 7, § 9, vol. I, p. 256.

³ The Massorah, letter 7, §§ 26-28, Vol. I, pp. 268, 269.

⁴ The Massorah, letter 7, §§ 33, 34, Vol. I, pp. 269, 270.

with the letter Aleph, and with the letter Vav, and vice versa.

These Massoretic Lists, however important as they assuredly are, by no means exhaust all the passages. They simply exhibit typical examples which may easily be multiplied from the ancient Versions. Without attempting to analyse the import of all the passages tabulated by the Massorites, I will point out the influence which the introduction of the *He* into the text has exercised both upon the orthography and the sense by adducing a few illustrations.

I shall quote first a few passages from the parallel records of the same event, narrated both in 2 Samuel V 9, VII 9 and 1 Chronicles XI 7, XVII 8 inasmuch as there can be no room for doubt here about the diversity of orthography in identically the same phrases, recording identically the same occurrence.

In 2 Sam. V 9 it is, "and David dwelt בְּמָצְרָ in the castle and he called her? the city of David": whereas in I Chron. XI 7 it is, "and David dwelt בַּמְצָרְ in the castle: therefore they called him³ the city of David." There can, therefore, be no doubt that the primitive form was בַּמְצַרְ בַּמַצֵּרְ the feminine. The redactor of Samuel who inserted the He, in accordance with the later mode of spelling, pointed it בַּמְצַרְה feminine, whilst the redactor of Chronicles retained the primitive form without the He, and hence pointed it בַּמְצַרְ which is masculine. It will be seen that this diversity of orthography necessitated also a change in the gender of the pronominal suffix, third person singular. This was more easily effected since it required no alteration

¹ The Massorah, letter 8, §§ 35, 47, 49, Vol I, pp. 270, 272, 273.

^{2 7} i. e. the castle, which is feminine.

³ Here the castle is in the masculine and hence 15, the masculine suffix.

in the letters, inasmuch as according to the ancient orthography the He stood also for the suffix, third person masculine. It was necessary only to pronounce it in the one case, and in the other.

In 2 Samuel VII 9 it is "and I have cast off (אברתה) all thine enemies", whereas in the parallel passage I Chronicles XVII 8, where the same event is recorded, it is "and I have cut off (וְאַבְרִית) all thine enemies". This diversity of spelling is manifestly due to the fact that in the primitive text it was simply אברת, which the redactor of Samuel resolved into וְאַבְרִתְּהָ by adding He at the end, whilst the redactor of Chronicles, demurring to this unique form, resolved it into וְאַבְרִית by inserting Yod in the middle, thus making it conformable to the other three instances where this Hiphil future first person singular occurs.

The absence of *He* in the primitive text explains a variation in the present text which affects the translation.

In 2 Sam. XXIV 13 it is "or wilt thou flee (קסָב) three months before thine enemies?", whereas in 1 Chron. XXI 12 it is "or wilt thou be destroyed (קסָב) three months before thine enemies". Originally the text was in both passages ¬ס; without He, which was afterward introduced into Chronicles by the redactor. It was a copyist, who at a later period mistook $\mathfrak I$ for $\mathfrak I$, as is evident from the Septuagint and the Vulgate which still have ¬ס;

In Jeremiah XXIII 5 it is "I will raise unto David (צמח צדיק) a righteous branch", whereas in the parallel passage in the same book, it is "I will cause to grow up unto David (צמה צַּדְקָה) the branch of righteousness" (XXXIII 15). The diversity in identically the same phrase, is however easily explained. The text originally had simply צדק

in both passages which the redactors of Jeremiah resolved, in one place into בְּדָקָה and in the other into בְּדָקָה In the one case they appended He (ה), in accordance with the later mode of spelling, and in the other they inserted Yod (י) in the middle of the word, just as they introduced the same letter into the middle of the word in I Chron. XVII 8.

The Massorah registers instances where the He is omitted at the end of the word, in the preterite third person feminine. It states, for example, that in Gen. XIX 23, Jerem. XLVIII 45, and Dan. VIII 9 אַץ stands for אָץ = אַץ ' But here again the passages must simply be regarded as typical, since according to the testimony of the ancient Versions other instances still existed where this primitive orthography obtained, which are not recognised by the Massorah. Another instance where אַץ ' stands for אַץ = אַץ ' is 2 Sam. XX 8 which according to the testimony of the Septuagint ought to be read "and it (i. e. the sword) came out and fell".

That in Gen. XXIX אַר פּרָאָ stood for קראָה = קראָה stood for יָּלְאָה "she called" is evident from the Samaritan and the Septuagint.

It is equally certain from the Samaritan, the Septuagint and the Syriac that ילד in Gen. XLVI 22 was read ילדָה "she bore".

The He was even omitted at the end when it was suffix third person singular feminine, e. g. אָישָׁה "her husband" 2 Sam. III 15 as is attested by the Septuagint, the Chaldee, the Syriac and the Vulgate, and is accepted by the best critics.

I have already adverted to the fact that the suffix third person singular masculine was written with He in the primitive text instead of Vav, and that the Massorah itself

¹ Comp. The Massorah, letter 3, § 472, Vol. I, p. 731.

gives a List of words which have not been made conformable to the later orthography. In all these instances the Massorah carefully directs that the words in question are to be read with Vav instead of He. There was, however, a difference of opinion in some of the Schools whether the He in certain words expressed the suffix third person singular feminine or masculine. A notable instance of it we have in בנצחה Levit. I 16. The School of Massorites which our recensions exhibit, resolved it into הַנְּנָתְה, whereas the School of textual critics exhibited in the Samaritan and Septuagint read it

1. — Far more arbitrary is the presence or absence of the letter Vav as a vowel-sign in the middle of the word. Even at the end of a verb the 3, which according to the present orthography is uniformly used in the preterite third person plural and the future third person masculine plural, was not unfrequently absent in the primitive forms. This is attested by the Massorah which gives a List of preterites third person plural, and futures third person masculine plural without Vav at the end2 and has given rise to various readings. When the letter in question was being gradually introduced into the text, a difference of opinion obtained in the ancient Schools, whether certain forms were singular or plural. A striking illustration of this fact is to be seen in the duplicate Psalm, viz. XIV and LIII. In the former the concluding verse is "Oh that from Zion were come (ישועה) the salvation of Israel", whereas in the duplicate it is "Oh that from Zion were come (ישעות) the salvations of Israel". It will be seen that in the one the noun is in the singular, whereas in the other the Vav is inserted to make it plural. That this, however,

¹ Comp. The Massorah, letter 7, \$\$ 47, 48, Vol. I, pp. 272, 273.

² Comp. The Massorah, letter *, § 146, Vol. I, p 422.

was the opinion of one School, and that another School read it in the singular in both places is evident from many MSS. as well as from the Septuagint and the Syriac.

In David's Hymn of Triumph of which there is a duplicate, viz. 2 Sam. XXII and Ps. XVIII, we have another striking illustration of the difference which obtained in the Schools as to whether the Vav is to be inserted or not. This difference which is not observed in the Authorised Version, is exhibited in verse 26. In 2 Sam. XXII 26 it is "with (בְּבוֹר תְבֵּיוֹן) the upright hero, thou wilt shew thyself upright", whereas in the parallel passage in Ps. XVIII 26 it is "with (בְּבֵּר תְבֵּיוֹן) the upright man thou wilt shew thyself upright". The primitive orthography was in both passages בּבַר hero, and hence inserted the Vav to indicate this reading, whilst the redactors of the Psalter read it בְּבֵר תְּבֵּר תְּבֵּר נְבֵּר רֵב וֹנִין man of, and hence declined to insert the Vav.

I shall now give a few typical examples of the absence of the Vav at the end, in plural verbs, according to the testimony of the ancient Versions, though not recognised by the Massorah. Both in Gen. XXXV 26 and XLVI 27 ילדו stands for ילדו were born the plural. This is the reading of several MSS., the Samaritan and the Septuagint, and in the former passage also of Onkelos, Jonathan, the Syriac and the Authorised Version and is undoubtedly the correct reading.

In Exod. XVIII 16 KD stands for RD = RD + they comc. This is attested by the Septuagint and is adopted in the Authorised Version.

In Numb. XXXIII אוישב is וישב is וישב and they turned again as is evident from the Samaritan and the context and is rightly exhibited in the Authorised Version.

Whilst in Deut. XXXII איהיי is יהי is יהי is יהי let them be, as is attested by Onkelos, the Samaritan, the Septuagint, the Syriac, and the Vulgate. This is also exhibited in the Authorised Version.

.— The same want of uniformity is exhibited in the present text with regard to the presence or absence of the letter Yod, as a vowel sign, for Chirek and Tzere in identically the same forms, thus showing that originally it was absent altogether, and that its insertion was gradual. The Massorah itself testifies to this fact inasmuch as it catalogues Lists of words in which the Yod has not been inserted after Chirek. Here again the Massorah must be regarded as simply giving typical instances. The parallel passages in the Massoretic text itself furnish far more striking examples.

Thus for instance in Josh. XXI, where the cities of refuge are described, it is in verse ואת חללן ואת־מגרשה 15 "and Holon with her suburbs", whereas in I Chron. VI 43, where we have identically the same description it is ואת־ "and Hilen with her suburbs". It is evident that originally the text had simply חלן, which was pronounced in some Schools it Cholon, and in other Schools הלז Chilen, and to mark this pronunciation, the latter inserted the Yod. This very description also furnishes an illustration of the gradual introduction of the Yod in plural nouns with the suffix third person singular feminine. With the exception of Josh. XXI 13, 40 מָנְרָשֶׁהָ her suburbs is without the Yod in all the forty-three times in this chapter; whereas in the parallel description in I Chron. VI 40-66 it is without exception מָנְרָשֵׁיהַ with Yod in all the fortyone instances. This primitive orthography has given rise to differences of opinion with regard to the import of

¹ Comp. The Massorah, letter 1, §§ 17-19, Vol. I, p. 678.

certain nouns, as is evident from החהם in Numb. VIII 4. The School of Massorites which has been followed by the redactors of our text regarded it as a singular with the suffix third person singular feminine and hence pointed it החום her flower. But the School which is represented by the Samaritan and the Septuagint took it as a plural, i. e. הַרְחֶיהְ = בְּרְחֶיהְ her flowers, and this is now accepted as the perferable reading by some of the best critics.

In I Kings XXII 35 it is "and the king was (מְשָׁבֶּר) stayed up in his chariot", whereas in the parallel passage in 2 Chron. XVIII 34 which gives identically the same description, it is "and the king of Israel (מַשְבֵּיך) stayed himself up in his chariot". Originally the text in both passages had מִשְבָּר, which the redactors of Kings pronounced הַשְּבֶּר, whilst the redactors of Chronicles pronounced it מַשְבָּר. To mark this difference in the pronunciation, the latter School of Massorites introduced the Yod.

In Jeremiah VI וז it is "neither could they הַּבְלִים לא ידעו הַבְּלִים לא ידעו blush", whereas in the parallel passage in VIII וב, where the same phrase occurs, it is יִרְעוּן. Originally both passages read הַבְּלִם, which one School pronounced and and the other הַבְּלָם, and marked the difference by inserting the Yod.

A noticeable instance where the absence of Yod in the primitive text has given rise to a difference of interpretation is to be found in Exod. XXXV 21, 22. In both these verses, which begin with ייבאו, the redactors of the present text regarded it as the Kal and hence pointed it "and they came".

It is, however, evident from the Samaritan and the Septuagint that in the School which these ancient authorities followed, it was regarded as the *Hiphil*, i. e. ייבאו "and they brought", a reading which is now accepted by some of the best critics especially as this identical form

without the Yod has still survived in no fewer than thirteen instances.¹

In the plural termination for the masculine gender which is now D' - the Yod was originally not expressed. The primitive orthography has still survived in a considerable number of words especially in the Pentateuch. Apart from the forms which occur only once 2 I adduce the following words which have retained the original spelling in one instance and which are to be found in other passages with the Yod inserted: שנברם menservants (Gen. XXIV 35), חומם twins (XXV 24), שרינם branches (XL 10), לפנם lice (Exod. VIII 12), ושׁלשם and captains (XIV 7), הַלְפִידָם among the gods (XV 11), הַלְפִידָם the lightnings (XX 18), חאמם doubled (XXVI 24), מאמם and the rulers (XXXV 27), הנותרם that were left (Levit. X 16), unto the he goats or satyrs (XVII 7), משירם and those that pitch (Numb. II 12), הַיָּמָם the days (VI 5), וַלְצְנִינָם and as thorns (XXXIII 55).

That these simply exhibit the instances which have escaped the process of uniformity, is evident from the ancient Versions. These Versions not only shew that there were many other passages in which the Yod was originally absent, but that a difference of opinion obtained in the Schools as to whether the Mem in certain cases denoted the plural, or the suffix third person plural masculine. It is evident that in Jerem. VI 15 it was originally בנפלם, which one School read בנפלם "among them that fall" and hence, to mark this reading inserted the Yod, i. e. whilst

¹ Comp. Numbers XXX 12, 54; Judg. XXI 12; I Sam. I 25; V 2; VII 1; 2 Sam. IV 8; VI 17; XXIII 16; I Kings I 3; VIII 6; IX 28; I Chton. I 18. Comp. The Massorah, letter 2, § 181, Vol. I, p. 175.

² מיִרְמְם מּיִרְמְם nahed (Gen. III 7), אַשּוּרִם וּלְטוּשָׁם Ashurim and Letushim (XXV 3), הַיִּבְם hot springs (XXXVI 24), מְקְרִיבִם they offer (Levit. XXI 6), אינכם מַאָּמִינִם ye did not believe (Deut. I 32) בּיִבָּטִם small rain (XXXII 2).

another School read it בְּנָפְּלָם and rendered it they shall utterly fall when they do fall, so the Septuagint. The same is the case in verse 29 of this very chapter. Here the original spelling was רְרָעָם, which one School read רְרָעָם and, therefore, inserted the Yod, and another School read it רְרָעָם. Hence the rendering of the Septuagint πουηρία αὐτῶν οὐκ ἐτάκη their wickedness has not melted away or consumed =

In Jer. XVII 25 the primitive text had מוכסום, which some resolved into ובסוסם and on horses and marked their reading by introducing the Yod, whilst others, as is evident from the Septuagint, καὶ ἵπποις αὐτῶν, read it וּבְּסוֹקִם and on their horses.

So too in Ezek. VII 24, the original spelling was manifestly which some read with the strong, and afterwards fixed this reading by inserting the Yod, while others read it with their strength. This is followed by the Septuagint which renders it τὸ φούαγμα τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτῶν the boasting of their strength = της για and this is the phrase which is to be found in XXIV 21.

According to the same testimony Ps. LVIII 12 had originally down, which was pronounced did it, i. e. God is judge by one School, and by another School did their judge, Septuagint ô θεὸς κοίνων αὐτοὺς God that judgeth them, which is now accepted by some critics as the correct reading.

The most striking illustration, however, of the absence of the Yod plural in the primitive text is to be found in Job XIX 18 where אוֹלִים מאסה בי is rendered by the Septuagint בּוֹלֵים מֹאסה בי is rendered by the Septuagint בּוֹלֵים מֹאסוֹ שִּנִילִים מַאַּסוֹ בִי is rendered by the Septuagint בּוֹלֵים מֹאסוֹ בִי is rendered by the septuagint בּוֹלֵים מֹאסוֹ בִי is rendered by the septuagint בּוֹלִים מֹאסוֹ בִי is rendered by the septuagint בּוֹלִים מֹאסוֹ בִי is rendered by the septuagint בּוֹלִים מֹאסוֹ בִּי יִ נִייִּלִים מַאַּסוֹ בִּי יִ יִּיִּלִים מַאַּסוֹ בִּי יִּיְלִים מַאַּסוֹ בִּי יִ יִּיִּלִים מַאַּסוֹ בִּי יִ יִּיִּלִים מַאַּסוֹ בִּי יִ יִּיִּלִים מַאַּסוֹ בּי יִ יִּיִּלִים מַאַּסוֹ בִּי יִ יִּיִּלִים מַאַּסוֹ בִּי יִ יִּיִּלִים מַאַּסוֹ בִּי יִי יִיִּים מַאַּסוֹ בִּי יִי יִיִּיִים מַּאַסוֹ בִּי יִי יִּיִּים מַאַּסוֹ בִּי יִי יִיִּיִים מַּאַסוֹ בִּי יִּיִי יִיִּים מַאַּסוֹ בִּי יִי יִייִּים מַּאַסוֹ בִּי יִי יִייִּים מַּאַּסוֹ בִּי יִי יִייִּים מַּאָּסוֹ בִּי יִי יִייִי מִּיִּים מַּאָּסוֹ בִּי יִּיִּים מַּאַּסוֹ בִּי יִ יִּיִּים מַּאָּסוֹ בִּי יִּיִי יִייִּים מַּאָּסוֹ בִּי יִי יִייִּים מַּאָּסוֹ בִּי יִי יִייִּים מַּאָּים מַּאָּיִי בְּיִים מַּאָּיִי בְּיִים מַּאָּים מִייִּים מַּאָּים מִייִּים מַּאָּים מִייִּים מַּיִּים מַּאָּים מִייִּים מִייִּים מַּאָּים מִייִּים מִייִּים מִייִּים מִייִּים מִייִּים מִּיִּים מִּיִּים מִייִּים מִּיִּים מִּיִּים מִּיִּים מִייִּים מִייִּים מִייִּים מִּיִּים מִייִּים מִּיִּים מִּיִּים מִּיִּים מִייִּים מִייִים מִייִּים מִייִּים מִייִּים מִּיִּים מִּיִּים מִּיִּים מִייִים מִּיִּים מִייִּים מִייִּים מִּיִּים מִּיִּים מִּיִּים מִּיִּים מִּיִּים מִּיִּים מִּיִּים מִּיִּים מִּיִּים מִּיִּיְיִים מִּים מִּיִּים מִּיִּים מִּיִּים מִּיְיִּים מִּיִּים מִּיִּים מִּיִים מִּיִּים מִּיְיִּים מִּיִּים מִּיִּים מִּיִּים מִּיִּים מִּיִים מִּיִּים מִּיְיִים מִּים מִּיִּים מִּיְיִּים מִּיְיִים מִּיְיִּים מִּיִּים מִּיְיִים מִּיְיִּים מִּיְיִים מִייִּים מִּיִּים מִּיְיים מִּיְים מִּיְיִים מִּיְיים מִּים מִּיְים

The same was the case with the Yod at the end of words denoting the plural construct. According to the Eastern School of Massorites שי in Judg. I 21 stands for ישׁבי י the inhabitants of, whilst the Westerns read it ישׁבי the inhabitant of in the singular.

Both the Eastern and Western Schools of Massorites agree that יבי in 2 Kings XII 12 stands for יבי the hands of, the plural, whilst the Massorah on 2 Kings XVII 31 remarks that אלהי stands for אלהי שאלהי the gods of, and that אלה ראשי באלהי אלה אלהי באלהי באלהי באלהי chiefs of.¹

This fact explains a number of conflicting readings which the present text exhibits in parallel passages. Thus in 2 Sam. V 6 it is היבסי יוֹשֵב הארץ the Jebusites the inhabitant of the land in the singular, and in 1 Chron. XI 4 היבוסי ישבי the Jebusites the inhabitants of the land in the plural. The text had originally ישב in both places, one School pronounced it ישב and inserted a Vav, i. e. יישב, whilst the other pronounced it ישבי and inserted a Yod.

In the parallel passage, which describes the conduct of Ahaziah, we are told in 2 Kings VIII 27 that he walked בְּדֶרְבָּי בִית אחב in the way of the house of Ahab, the singular and in 2 Chron. XXII 3 that he walked בְּדְרְבִי בִית וֹח the ways of the house of Ahab in the plural. Both passages had originally בדרכ which one School pronounced בְּדֶרְבָּ, and the other בְּדֶרְבָּ, and the other בְּדֶרְבָּ, and appended the Yod to mark this pronunciation.

The same is the case in 2 Kings XVIII 28, and Isa. XXXVI 13, where identically the same description is given, yet in the one passage it is שמעו דְּבֶר־המלך הגדול "Hear the word of the great king" the singular and in the other שמעו את־דְבְרִי המלך הגדול "Hear the words of the great king" the plural. The primitive text in both places was

Comp. The Massorah, letter ', § 28, Vol. I, p. 681.

קבר, which one School pronounced דְּבֶּר, and the other and hence appended the Yod to mark this pronunciation.

In some passages the different solutions of the original spelling simply resulted in the difference of orthography without affecting the sense at all. Thus in the description of the solemn covenant which Josiah made with the elders and the inhabitants of Jerusalem, we are told in 2 Kings XXIII 3 that he pledged them ללכת יהוה "to walk after the Lord", and in 2 Chron. XXXIV 31 where identically the same description is given, it is pronounced in the one School אָחָרי יהוה and in the other אַחָרי בּ אַחַרי and though this is the plural construct it denotes exactly the same thing.

In other places, however, the different solutions of the primitive orthography on the part of the Scribes produced a marked difference in the sense in the parallel passages, and it is sometimes difficult to decide which of the two readings is to be preferred. Thus, in the admonition which Gedaliah gives to the captains of the army and to their people, he tells them, according to 2 Kings XXV 24 אל־תיראו מעבדי הכשרים "Fear not because of the servants of the Chaldees", and in Jerem. XL 9, where the same event is recorded, it is אל־תיראו מעבוד הכשדים "fear not to serve the Chaldeans". The variation is easily explained. The primitive orthography in both passages was מעבד, which was resolved by the redactors of Kings into מעבן and they marked this reading by appending the Yod, i. e. מעבדי, whereas the redactors of Jeremiah resolved it into מעבר and fixed this reading by inserting the Vav, i. e. מעבור. The latter is more in harmony. with the context. The Septuagint, however, shews that in the text which they had before them it was מעבדי = מעבד in both places.

The arbitrary treatment to which the orthography was subject, due to the gradual introduction of the quiescent letters, and to the expression of the different manner of reading some words in the vowelless text was not remedied by the rules which obtained in the Talmudic period with regard to the *matres lectiones*. This will be seen from the following canon:

Three mistakes [in each Column] may be corrected, but if there are four the Codex must be buried. It is propounded: If the Codex has one correct column it saves the whole Codex. R. Isaac b. Martha said in the name of Rab if the greater part of the Codex is correct. Said Abayi to R. Joseph if the Codex has three mistakes in one column what is to be done? He replied. It must be given to be corrected and it is right. This [i. e. the duty to correct it] is applicable to defectives only [i. e. when plenes have been written defective], but in the case of plenes [i. e. when plenes have been written instead of defectives] we need not trouble about it.

That is, when this is the case, no duty devolves upon the Scribe to have the Codex corrected. (Menachoth 29b.)¹

According to this rule, therefore, to write a plene defective, is a serious mistake which may be corrected when only three such mistakes occur in one column, but when there are four, the Codex must be surrendered to the *Geniza*. This canon, however, does not apply to cases of a reverse nature. No serious mistake is committed when defectives have been written plene. The result of this

ו שלש יתקן, ד' יננז, תנא אם יש בו דף אחת שלימה מצלת על כולו, א"ר יצחק בר שמואל בר מרתא משמיה דרב והוא דבתיב רוביה דספרא שפיר, א"ל אביי לרב יוסף א' א'ת בההוא דף שלש פעיות מאי, א"ל הואיל ואיתיהיב לאיתקוני מיתקן והני מלי חסירות אבל יתירות לית לן בה: מנחות כ"ט.

² Maimonides describes the Geniza as follows: מ"ח שבלה או שוכם מודי שבלה או שנפסל מודי חרם וקוברין אותו אצל תלמידי חכמים ווו גניותו a Codex of the Law which is decayed or is rendered ritually illegal is to be put into an earthen vessel and buried by the side of sages, and this constitutes its Geniza. (Hilchoth Sepher Thorah X 3).

rule was that when the Scribe was in doubt whether a word is to be written plene or defective he naturally wrote it plene since he thereby committed no mistake even if the word in question ought properly to have been written defective. This explains the fact that so many cases of plene have with impunity crept into the MSS. Hence in weighing the evidence, the benefit of the doubt is generally to be given to the defective, though this reading is numerically supported by fewer MSS. and editions.

¹ A very able article on the gradual development of the matres lectiones in the Bible and on the Rabbinic law respecting it by Dr. Bardowicz is given in the Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums. Vol. XXXVIII, pp. 117—121; 157—166. Breslau 1894.

Chap. III.

The Division of Words.

From the fact that both in the Inscription of Mesha and of Siloam the words are separated by a point, whilst in the Inscriptions on gems and coins, as well as those in Phoenician, there is generally no such separation, it is fairly concluded that originally the words were not strictly divided and that the process of division like that of the scriptio plena was of gradual development. This derives confirmation from the Massorah and the ancient Versions.

The Massorah gives two Lists of words which, according to the School of Massorites whence they emanate, ought to be differently divided. The first List catalogues fifteen instances in which the text exhibits single words whereas they ought each to be divided into two separate words. The second List gives eight passages in which words exhibit examples of a contrary nature. These words have been wrongly divided into two, and the Massorah directs that they should respectively be read as one word. These words are duly noticed as the official *Keris*, or various readings in the margin of the Bible in the places where they occur.

Here, however, as is often the case with other Massoretic Rubrics, the instances are simply to be regarded as typical, or are to be taken as passages recognised by the particular School which formulated the Lists in question. That other Schools of textual critics had different and longer Lists is evident both from the Massorah itself and the ancient Versions. Thus according to the ordinarily received Massoretic text I Kings XX 33 וְיִּחְלְמֵּר הַמְּמֵנוֹ is the proper division of these two words, and hence this passage is not

¹ Comp. The Massorah, letter 3, §§ 482, 483, Vol. II, p. 54.

included in the Lists, but we now know from MSS. that the Easterns had divided them into וַיַּחַלְּמֵוּרָ.

A careful comparison of the Septuagint with the present Hebrew text undoubtedly shows that in the text which the Greek translators had before them, there were many more passages in which the words were otherwise divided. In the following table I indicate some of the passages in the order of the books in which they occur.

	Original Text	The division in the ancient Versions	Massoretic Division
I Sam. I 24	בפרמשלש	בפר משלש Septuagint and Syriac.	בְּפָּרִים שְׁלֹשָׁה
" XIV 21	סבבונס	קבר נם Septuagint Syriac.	סָבִיב וְנַם
2 Sam. XXI I	ביתהדמים	בֵּיתֹה דָמִים Sept.	בֿיע בֿבֿמִם
Jerem. XXIII 33	אתמהמשא	אָתֶם הַמְשָא Sept. Vulg. Rashi.	אֶת-מַה-מַשָּׂא
Ezek. XLVIII 11	המקדשמבני	הַמְקְדָשִׁים בְּנֵי Chaldee, Sept. Syriac.	הַמְּקָדָשׁ מִבְּנֵי
Hos. VI 5	ומשפטיכאור	ומשפטי כאור Chaldee, Sept. Syriac.	וּמִשְׁפָּטִיךּ אוֹר
" XI 2	מפניהם	מַּבְנִי הַם Sept. Syriac.	מפָניהֶם
Ps. XI I	הַרכם	הר כמ = כמו Chaldee, Sept. Syriac.	בַּרְכֶּם
" XVI 3	בארצהמהואדירי	יבוק. באַרְצֹה מְהַאָּהִיר י׳ = יְהוָה	בָּאָבֶץ הַמָּה וְאַדִּיבִי
" LV 20	ויענמוישב	Septuagint. וִיעַנָמוֹ ישֵׁב Sept. Syriac.	וַיַעָנָם וְישֵׁב
" LXXI 3	לבואתמירצוית	לבית מצורות Sept. Vulg. Comp.	לָבּוֹא תָמִיד צִוִּיתָ
" LXXV 2	וקרובשמך	Ps. XXXI 3. וְלֶרוֹ = וְלֶרוֹא בִּשְׁמֶּךְ וֹלֶרוֹ = וְלֶרוֹא בִּשְׁמֶּךְ Sept. Syr. Vulg. Comp. Ps. XCIX 6.	וְקָרוֹב שְׁמֶּדְ
" LXXVI 7	נרדמורכבוסום	נְרְדְמוּ רֹכְבֵי סוּס Sept, Syr. Vulg.	נלבם וֹנכפר נֹסוּם
" LXXXV 9	ואלישובולכסלה		וְאַל־יָשׁוּבוּ לְבִסְלָה
Prov. XIV 13	ואחריתהשמחה	וְאַחְרִית הַשְּׁמְחָה Chald. Sept. Syr. Vulg.	וְאַחְרִיתָה שִּׂמְחָה

These are simply typical instances. I adduce them because they are now regarded as exhibiting more faithfully the original text than the Massoretic division, and are adopted by some of the best Biblical critics. And though I fully agree with their opinion I have adopted these readings in the marginal notes only, on account of my principle not to introduce any change in the body of the Massoretic text itself. They are preceded in my notes by the abbreviation אַריד להיות בייל it ought to be so, i. e. it is the correct reading wherever the ancient Versions confirm such a re-division of the words.

There are, however, other passages where the context suggests a re-division of some of the words, which most accurate and most conscientious critics have not hesitated to adopt, though they are not supported by the ancient Versions. Thus for instance the last word in Gen. XLIX 19 and the first word in verse 20 which are in the Massoretic text מַבְּבָּב: מָאָשֶׁר and which were originally are re-divided into מַבְּבָב: אָשֶׁר. This not only obviates the harshness of the construction and removes the anomaly of אָשֶׁר alone beginning with the preposition Mem when all the other tribes begin without it, but yields an excellent sense

"Gad. a troop shall press upon him, But he shall press upon their heels; Asher, his bread shall be etc."

The Revisers who have also taken over the Mcm from the beginning of the next verse have translated it doubly, as the suffix to אָשֶׁר heel and the proposition of אָשֶׁר Asher.

I Kings XIX 21 is translated both in the Authorised Version and in the Revised Version boiled their flesh. This is simply an expedient to get over the difficulty in the text which as it now stands means he boiled them the flesh.

There is hardly any doubt that the primitive orthography was בשלמהבשר and ought to be divided בשלמהבשר he boiled some of the flesh.

In Isa. IX 2, as the text now stands one hemistich contradicts the other, inasmuch as it says:

"Thou hast multiplied the nation,
Thou hast not increased the joy.

They joy before Thee according to the joy &c."

The official Keri, which substitutes the relative pronoun ל, to him, for the negative לל, not, and which the Revised Version follows, is evidently due to a desire to remove this contradiction at the sacrifice of the idiom which requires that it should follow and not precede the verb. All difficulty, however, disappears and the rhythm of the passages is restored when we bear in mind that the original orthography was הַנִילָּה = הֹנִילָּא which has been wrongly divided into two words and the mater lectionis Vav was introduced to mark this reading. The passage ought, therefore, to be rendered:

"Thou hast multiplied their joy
Thou hast increased their rejoicing
They joy before Thee according to the joy in harvest,
And as men rejoice when they divide the spoil."

Ps. LXVIII 18, which describes Jehovah's march to transfer His throne from Sinai to the Sanctuary, is obscured in the present text. In endeavouring to impart sense to the passage, the Authorised Version renders the second clause:

"The Lord is among them, as in Sinai in the holy place."

¹ It ought to be mentioned that the late Professor Selwyn in his Horae Hebraicae, p. 27, Cambridge 1848, has come to the same conclusion.

The difficulty is not removed in the Revised Version which has it:

"The Lord is among them, as in Sinai in the Sanctuary", with the marginal note "Or Sinai is the Sanctuary".

The sense is perfectly plain when we resort to the primitive orthography where it was בְּם בַּמְסִינִי = בַּמְסִינִי, i. e.

"The Lord hath come from Sinai into the Sanctuary."

For an exact parallel, where the *Aleph* is omitted in such cases in the primitive orthography, see Gen. XXX 11; and comp. above p. 140.

For these examples there is no support from the ancient Versions, but they are suggested by the context and sense; and Biblical critics are more or less unanimous in accepting them. I have, therefore, given them in the marginal notes preceded by the abbreviation to the marginal to the marginal it appears to me, I am of opinion, in contradistinction to those which have the support of the Versions and are preceded by <math>to the marginal to the marginal to the support of the versions and the student, who can either accept or reject them.

Chap. IV.

The Double or Final letters.

The fact that the Hebrew Scriptures were originally written in the ancient Hebrew or Phoenician characters, and that this alphabet has no final letters, shows beyond doubt that the double letters were gradually developed after the introduction of the present square characters. The Massorah itself has preserved two Lists of variants which presuppose the non-existence of the double letters. These Lists record instances where the text reads one word and the margin reads two words; and *vice versa*, passages in which the text has two words and the margin one word. From these Lists ¹ I subjoin the following examples in the order of the books in which they occur:

		Text	Margin
ı Sam. IX	I	מבן ימין	מבנימין
" XXIV	9	מן המערה	מהמערה
2 Sam. XXI	12	שם הפלשתים	שמה פלשתים
Isa. IX	6	לם רבה	לםרבה.
Job XXXVIII	I	מנהסערה	מן הסערה
" XL	6	מנסערה	מן סערה
Lament, I	6	מן בת	מבת
Neh. II	13	המפרוצים	הם פרוצים
I Chron. XXVII	12	לבנימיני	לבן ימיני

These variants could not possibly have obtained if the final letters had existed.

¹ Comp. The Massorah, letter 2, §§ 482, 483, Vol II, p. 54.

It is moreover certain that the translators of the Septuagint had no knowledge of these final letters. This is attested by numerous passages in this Version from which I select the following instances:

			Septuagint		Massoretic Text
Gen. 2	XVIII	19	Οὐλαμλοὺζ =	אולמלוז	אולם לוז
Numb. N	XXXIV	11	ἀπὸ Σεπφαμὰο Βηλὰ =	משפמר בלה	משפם הרבלה
2 Kings	II	14	ἀφφώ ==	אפהוא	אף הוא
Jerem.	xxxi	8	ἐν ἑορτῆ =	במוער	בם עור
Hos.	VI	5	καὶ τὸ κρίμα μου ὡς φῶς = '	ומשפטי כאור	ומשפטיך אור
Nahum	1	12	κατάρχων ύδάτων =	משל מים	אם שלמים
Zeph.	111	19	έν σοὶ ἕνεμεν σοῦ ==	אתך למעניך	את כל מעניך
Zech.	XI	7	είς την Χαναανίτιν ==	לבנעני	לכן עניי
Ps.	XLIV	5	δ Θεός μου ὁ έντελλόμενος =	אלהי מצוה:	אלהים צוה
n	LXIV	7	έξερευνῶντες έξερευνήσει =	חפשם חפש	חפש מחפש
Prov.	XII	4		בעץ מותת	בעצמותיו
Neh.	VII	34	'Ηλαμαάρ =	עילמאר	עילם אחר

The fact, therefore, that the ancient translators frequently read the same consonants as one word which the present text reads as two words, in cases where the last letter of the first word is one of the five final letters, shows conclusively that these final letters did not exist at the time when the Septuagint version was made. With a text before them in which one form of a letter was used at the beginning and in the middle of a word, and another form at the end, these joinings together of two words into one word would have been impossible on the part of the Greek translators. I have deemed it necessary to make this point clear because I have adopted in the notes, some of the re-divisions of words preserved in the ancient Versions, in passages where the final letters of the present text might be thought absolutely to preclude such re-divisions.

Chap. V.

Abbreviations.

All post-Biblical Hebrew writings contain copious abbreviations. Students of the Talmud, the Midrashim and the mediaeval religious literature generally know frequently to their discomfort, that there is hardly a page in which these puzzling expressions are not to be found; and how grateful they are for those special Treatises which have been written to aid them in resolving these embarrassing abbreviations, which sometimes represent a whole sentence.

In the Biblical MSS. with the Massorah, it is well known that the latter abounds in abbreviations. In the text itself, however, these abbreviations are as a rule not tolerated. When the line is insufficient to take in the last word, the vacant space is generally filled out with dots or is in unfinished letters. This is the case in Orient. 4445, which is the oldest portion of the Hebrew Bible known at present, and in the St. Petersburg Codex of the Latter Prophets dated A. D. 916. In the St. Petersburg Codex, however, the word which is too large for the end of the line is not unfrequently represented in an abbreviation of one, two or even three letters at the end, but the whole word is also repeated at the beginning of the next line. Thus in Isa. VIII א מוראכם stands for מוראכם at the end of the line and the whole word is repeated at the commencement of the next line. In Isa IX 8 וכנדל stands for מנדל at the end, but the whole word is also given at the beginning of the next line. The same is the case in XIV 2 where a stands for

There are, however, MSS. which have abbreviations in the text, but in which the abbreviated part of the word is given in the margin. Thus Codex No. 15 in the Imperial and Royal Court Library Vienna, which contains the Pentateuch, the Haphtaroth and the Five Megilloth and which is a Model Codex, exhibits numerous instances of this kind. I extract from it the following examples:

Gen.	X 16	רי	דָאֱמֹ	fol, 9 <i>a</i>
,,	XVII 20	ויך	שְׁמַעְתִּי	, 14 <i>b</i>
,,	" 26	אל	וִישְׁמֶע	" 14 <i>b</i>
,,	XVIII 21	תה	הַבְּצַעְקָ	" 15 <i>b</i>
n	XX 15	ر ه ا	אֲבִימֶ	" 18 <i>a</i>
n	XXII 18	כוּ	וֹבִיתְבָּבֵּ	" 20 <i>a</i>
77	XXIV 17	ਜਨ੍ਹ	לִקְרָא	" 21 b
, ,,,	XXV 18	ים	מֹצְרַ	, 23b
n	XXVII 12	תַּעַ	בְמְתַעְ	" 25 <i>b</i>
, ,,,	XXXII 20	ֶכֶם	במצא	" 32 <i>b</i>
"	81 IVXXX	מָה	אָהָלִיבְ	" 36 <i>a</i>

The same is the case in No. 5 of this Collection which contains the Prophets, of which the following examples will suffice:

Josh.	VI	12	5	הפהני	fol. 5 <i>b</i>
,,	VII	3	ה	שׁמַ <i>ַ</i> שׁמַ	, 6b
, ,,	,,	4	7	וַיָּנָם	" 6b

A very remarkable use of abbreviations with their compliments is exhibited in Codex No. 3 in the Madrid University Library. When a word is too long for the line,

a portion of it is given in the text and the rest is either put perpendicularly in the margin or is placed above the abbreviated word as will be seen from the following example:

Levit.	XV	31	משמ ב ב
n	xvIII	3	וּכְמַעֲ וּכְמַעֲ
n	XXII	2	שִׁים מַקְּדָּ
"	n	3	ڔؙؠڔۺ ^ڎ ڎؗڡ
"	"	4	זָב בַּקָּרָשׁ מ
,	XXIII	19	וַעָשִׁיתֶּ
77	"	36	מָקְרָ ,
n	XXVI	25	וְשָׁלַחְ תִּי

In some instances the finishing part of the word is not given in the margin so that the text exhibits a regular abbreviation.

The question which, therefore, naturally arises is—seeing that abbreviations are copiously used in the oldest extra-canonical writings, and that they are not only to be found on the Maccabean coins, but that they occur conjointly with the fully written out word in Biblical MSS. — Were they ever used by themselves in the Hebrew text? As we have no Biblical MSS. of the pre-Talmudic period, we have to appeal for the answer to the ancient Versions which were made from a text written prior to the orthographical laws laid down by the Scribes. Chief among the ancient witnesses, which bear testimony to the use of abbreviations in the Hebrew text, is the Septuagint. From a number of passages it is perfectly evident that the translators had a Hebrew text before them in which half

words and even single letters were used as abbreviations. I subjoin the following passages as typical examples:

In Gen. XLVII אח"ין = אחין was read by the translators of the ancient Versions as an abbreviation for the brethren of Joseph. This is attested by the Samaritan, Jonathan, the Septuagint and the Syriac and is undoubtedly the correct reading. A similar abbreviation occurs in 2 Sam. III 27 where אחיין stands for אחיין the brother of Joab as it is resolved in the Septuagint.

In Levit. VI 10, according to the testimony of the Samaritan, the Septuagint and the Vulgate, מאשי stands for the offerings of Jehovah. This is not only confirmed by verse 11, but by some MSS.

In Numb. XXIII ומספר is an abbreviation for אָלָי מְפַר = וּמָ מְפַר and who can number. This is the solution of the Septuagint and is the reading of some of the Samaritan MSS. Accordingly the verse ought to be rendered:

"Who can count the dust of Jacob
And who can number the fourth part of Israel."

It will be seen that this restores the parallelism which is marred by the Massoretic solution.¹

In Deut. XXXII 35 לי, as is evident from Onkelos, the Samaritan and the Septuagint, is an abbreviation of ליום for the day. Accordingly the passage is to be rendered:

"Is not this laid up in store with me, Sealed up in my treasuries?

י This solution is also implied in the explanation of this passage given in the Midrash יוכל למנות אוכלוםין שלהן, מי יוכל למנות אוכלוםין שראל הרביעית שלהן, מי יוכל למנות אוכלוםין Comp. Bamidbar Rab.. § 20.

For the day of vengeance and recompense, For the time when their foot shall slip."

It will thus be seen that לְּעָת for the day and לְּעָת for the time obtain their natural parallelism and that the third line corresponds to the first, and the fourth to the second line in accordance with one of the laws of Hebrew parallelism.

In 2 Sam. V 25 מגבעון is an abbreviation of מגבעון from Gibeon. This is not only attested by the Septuagint, but is confirmed by the parallel passage in 1 Chron. XIV 16, which records the same event. This removes the discrepancy between the two passages which narrate identically the same occurrence.

In 2 Sam. XVII בקרב is an abbreviation of in the midst of them, and the passage ought to be rendered:

"and thou thyself shalt go in the midst of them."

This is not only the solution of the abbreviation in the Septuagint and Vulgate, but is most suitable to the context. Besides קָרָב is never used in Samuel for battle or war which is invariably מַלְחָבָה.

These are simply a few of the abbreviations which are supported by the ancient Versions and which I have adopted in the notes as affording a better solution than those exhibited in the received text.

I have also suggested a few not given in the ancient Versions. Thus for instance:

In I Kings XXI 23 בחל is manifestly an abbreviation of בְּחֵלֶּק in the portion of. This is rendered certain from the parallel passages in 2 Kings IX 10, 36 and is adopted in the margin of the Revised Version.

In 2 Kings VI 27 the words אַל־יוֹשָעֶךְ יְהוָה which literally denote let not Jehovah help thee, are simply per-

plexing. The rendering of the Authorised Version: "If the Lord do not help thee", is contrary to the meaning of אַל. Nor is the difficulty removed by the marginal rendering in the Revised Version: "Nay, let the Lord help thee", since this is a departure from the normal sense of this negative particle. The sentence is relieved and the construction becomes grammatical if א is taken as the abbreviation of which is the proper Hebrew equivalent for

If the Lord do not help thee.

In 2 Kings XVIII 2 and 2 Chron. XXIX 1 the same narrative is recorded. In the former the name of the mother of Hezekiah is given as אָבי Abi, and in the latter as אָבי Abijah. This discrepancy in identically the same record, is removed by the fact that אבי is the abbreviation of אָביָה. Such a name as אָבי Abi does not occur in the Hebrew Bible.

In the abbreviations I have carefully distinguished those which are supported by the ancient Versions from those which I have suggested. The former are preceded by צריך להיות = צ"ל it should be and the latter by נראה לי it appears to me.

Chap. VI.

Homoeoteleuton.

All those who are familiar with transcribing know by experience the omissions which are due to what is technically called homoeoteleuton; that is when the clause ends with the same word as closes a preceding sentence. The transcriber's eye in such a case frequently wanders from one word to the other, and causes him to omit the passage which lies between them. The same effect is produced when two or more sentences begin with the same words. As this fruitful source of error has hitherto been greatly neglected by those who have been engaged in the criticism of the Hebrew text, it necessitates my discoursing upon it at somewhat greater length. In proving the existence of omissions arising from this cause, I shall arrange the instances according to the age of the respective MSS. in which I have found them, and not in the order of the books wherein they occur. My reason for adopting this chronological plan is to show that this cause of error has been in operation in all ages and in all countries from which our Biblical MSS, are derived.

In Oriental 4445 (fol. 107 a), which is the oldest Biblical MS. known at present, the whole of Levit. XXI 24 was originally omitted, because it begins with יוֹדְבֶּר and he spake and XXII 1 also begins with מוֹדְבֶּר and he spake. The Scribe's eye wandered from one word to the other which is identically the same. The verse has been added by a later hand.

In the St. Petersburg or Babylon Codex, which is dated A. D. 916 (fol. 90 a), Jerem. XXXI 30 is omitted because of the homoeoteleuton אָקְהָינָה shall be set on edge אַקְהָינָה shall be set on edge. A later Scribe has supplied the omission and disfigured the MS.

In the same MS. (fol. 139 a), the last clause of Ezekiel XVIII 30 and the first clause of verse 31 are omitted, viz. יְלֹא־יִהְיָה לָכֶם לְמִכְשׁוֹל עָוֹן: הַשְׁלִיכוּ מֵעֲלִיכָם אָת־בְּל־פִּשְׁעֵיכֶם so iniquity shall not be your ruin: cast away from you your transgressions, because of the homoeoteleuton your transgressions. The passage which lies between the same words and which has thus been omitted, is supplied in the margin by a later hand.

In Arundel Oriental 16, a superbly written Franco-German MS. of about A. D. 1250, nearly the whole verse in 2 Chron. XXVI 9 and the first two words of verse 10 are omitted, owing to the homoeoteleuton בּירוֹשֶׁלֵם עַל־שַׁעַר הַפְּנָה towers, viz. בְּירוֹשֶׁלֵם עַל־שַׁעַר הַפְּנָה in Jerusalem at the corner gate, and at the valley gate, and at the turn ing of the wall, and fortified them. And he built towers (comp. fol. 273 a). The omission, as usual, has been supplied in the margin by a later Scribe. When it is stated that this is a most carefully and sumptuously written MS., furnished with the most copious Massorah, and that it was manifestly a model Codex, it is evident that it required superhuman care to avoid the errors arising from this source.

In Add. 9401—9402 dated A. D. 1286 (fol. 18 a), the whole of Gen. XVIII 32 is omitted, owing to the ending for forty's sake בַּעְבוּר הָעֶשֶׂרִים for ten's sake verses 31 and 32. The omission as usual has been supplied by a later hand.

In the same MS. the second part of Levit. XV 4 is omitted owing to the two clauses ending with NDC shall

be unclean יְמְלָא shall be unclean. The clause יְבֶּלִי הַּזְּב יִמְבָּא and every thing whereon he sitteth shall be unclean is added in the margin by a subsequent reviser (comp. fol. 115 b).

In Oriental 2091 a magnificently written MS. of the German School, circa A.D. 1300, I found no fewer than forty-three omissions due to homoeoteleuta, in the Prophets and Hagiographa which this Codex contains. 1

These omissions continued uninterapteally even in the MSS. which were written after the invention of printing. Thus in Add. 15251 a choice Spanish Codex, written in 1488, the very year in which the first edition of the entire Hebrew Bible was published, there is the omission of the words על־משהו: וְאַת שׁם אַהְרֹן הְּכָהֹב upon his rod; And the name of Aaron thou shalt write Numb. XVII, 17, 18, due to the homoeoteleuton הְּכָהֹב thou shalt write (comp. fol. 93 a).

In the same MS. fol. 93 b, the second half of Numb. XXVI 62 is omitted, i. e. פִי לא־נִתּן לְהֶם נַחֲלָה בְּתוֹךְ בָּנִי יִשְׂרָאֵל
because there was not given them an inheritance among the children of Israel, due to the two clauses ending in יִשְׂרָאֵל
Israel... יִשְׂרָאֵל

These examples might be multiplied almost indefinitely. If the omissions in the Hebrew text due to this cause occur not only in the very first or oldest MS., but continue in the succeeding MSS. produced in different centuries and various countries, and also appear in the very latest Codex copied by the human hand, it is perfectly certain that the same source of error was in operation

¹ The following are some of them: Josh. III 17, IV ו היררן, היררן, היררן היררן קורה. 13 a; Josh. XV 63 בני יהודה. בני יהודה, fol. 13 a; Judg. VII 19, z0 הלילה. הלילה fol. 26 a; Judg. XVI 3 הלילה. הלילה, fol. 33 b; I Sam. XIV 40 אחד אחד לעבר אחד, fol. 46 a; I Kings VII 4, 5 שמים... שלש פעמים... שלש פעמים... שלש פעמים... שלש פעמים... שלש פעמים...

in the production of the MSS. prior to those which we now possess. In the absence of these MSS., however, the only course left to us is carefully to examine the ancient Versions which were made from a Hebrew recension older by more than a millennium than the oldest MSS. of the present Massoretic text.

A comparison of the present text with the ancient Versions for the purpose of ascertaining whether the Scribes have omitted passages due to homoeoteleuta from the time of the Septuagint down to the date of our oldest MS., just as they have omitted them from the period of the oldest Codex down to the invention of printing, is far more easy and much more certain in result than the utilization of the Version for merely various readings. In the case of retranslating into Hebrew a variant exhibited in the Greek, scholars may differ as to the exact Hebrew equivalent for a single word. But there can be no question in deciding whether the ancient Version has a whole sentence more than is to be found in the present Hebrew text, more especially if the sentence which is found in the Greek, when re-translated into Hebrew, fits in between the two words of similar ending. The certainty in this case is as great as the proper fitting in of the pieces in a dissected puzzle-map. Indeed it carries far more conviction than the testimony of a few Codices in a mass of conflicting MSS., as to the right reading in a given passage.

The first instance which I shall adduce to prove that owing to the cause here stated, passages have been omitted by Scribes in the MSS. produced after the Septuagint and prior to the date of any Codex which we now possess, is from the Book of Kings.

In I Kings VIII 16 the text now is

Hebrew

Septuagint

ואבחר בִּירוּשֶׁלַם לִהְיוֹת שְׁמִי שָׁם ואבחר בְּדָוִר לִהְיוֹת עַל־עַמְּי יִשְׂרָאֵל

From the simple exhibition of these two passages it will be seen that the Septuagint has preserved the original reading and that the Scribe's eye, in copying the Massoretic text, has wandered from one and I have chosen to the other and I have chosen. Hence the omission of the clause and I have chosen Jerusalem that my name might be there. In this case, however, we are not left to the Septuagint alone to establish the fact. In the parallel narrative 2 Chron. VI 6, where the same incident is narrated, the omission is literally given.

ואבחר בִּירוּשָׁלַם לִהְיוֹת שָׁמִי שָׁם ואבחר בְּרָוִד לִהְיוֹת עַל־עַמִּי יִשְׂרָאֵל

"And I have chosen Jerusalem that my name might be there and I have chosen David &c."

But though this omission is incidentally confirmed by the parallel passage, the other instances, for which there are no duplicate records in the Hebrew Scriptures, are equally conclusive. Some of these I shall now give in the order in which they occur.

Here the clause and the two young men came to Jericho is omitted because of the similar words and they came.... and they came. They are preserved in the Septuagint.

ולמובח יְהְיָה הַיּה יִשְבֵּי גְבְעוֹן הּמְבֵּי עַצִּים וְשֹאֲבֵי מִיִם Sept. אלהים וְהָיוּ ישְבֵּי גְבְעוֹן הּמְבֵּי עַצִּים וְשֹאֲבֵי מִיִם למוֹבח אלהִים למוֹבח אֵלהִים

Here, after the words "and for the altar of God", the following words are omitted: "And the inhabitants of Gibeon became hewers of wood, and drawers of water for the altar of God" because of the two similar endings "the altar of

God".... the altar of God. They are preserved in the Septuagint.

Here the words "when they destroyed them in Gibeon, and they were destroyed from before the children of Israel" are omitted because of the two endings Israel....Israel. They are preserved in the Septuagint.

שבט המשה הודי שבט המשה מן־הַנְּרָדְן עַריהַיָּם הַנְּרוֹל יָמָה תְּתְנֶנָה הַנִּם הַנְּרוֹל Sept. שבט המנשה מְן־הַנִּרְדִן עַריהַיָּם הַנְּרוֹל יָמָה תִּתְנֶנָה הַנְּשׁה יִהְנִשׁה יִהְנִשׁה יִהְנִשׁה יִהְנִשׁה יִהְנִשׁה יִהְעָּם וַחֲצִי שבט הנשה

Here the words "from the Jordan to the great sea west-ward thou shall give it, the great sea shall be the boundary; and unto the half tribe of Manasseh" are omitted because of the two similar endings the half tribe of Manasseh.... the half tribe of Manasseh.

Josh, XXIV 6 Heb. מצרים מצרים ביידיו שָׁם לְנוֹי נָרוֹל וְעָצוֹם וְרָב וַיַּעֲנוּ אֹתָם חמצרים

Here the words "and they became there a great, populous and mighty people and the Egyptian afflicted them" are omitted because of the two similar endings in the Hebrew, Egypt.... Egypt. The Septuagint has preserved them.

Josh. XXIV 17 Heb. . . . הוא המעלה הוא המעלה אלהים הוא מעלה הוא אלהים הוא אלהים הוא מעלה הוא אלהים הוא מעלה
Here the words He is God are omitted because of the two endings he....he. The Septuagint has preserved them.

Here the clause "then shall I be weak as another man. And it came to pass when he was asleep that Delilah took the seven locks of his head and wove them with the web and fastened them with a pin" is omitted because of the two similar endings and fastened them with a pin... and fastened them with a pin. That the Septuagint exhibits the primitive text is moreover confirmed by the fact that the Massoretic text as it now stands says nothing about Samson having gone to sleep though verse 14 alludes to it.

שבית מיכה מיכה בית מיכה אבית מיכה Sept. מבית מיכה והנה מיכה

Here the words "and behold Micah" are omitted because of the homoeoteleuton Micah Micah. They are preserved in the Septuagint.

ז Sam. III וז Heb. יער הבקר אד Sept. ער הבקר ויַשְׁכֵּב בבקר

Here the words "and he rose early in the morning" are omitted because of the homoeoteleuton the morning. ... the morning. They are preserved in the Septuagint.

יהוה X I Heb. יהוה יהוה לְנָנִיד עַל-עַמוֹ עַל-יִשְׂרָאֵל וְאָהָה תַעֲצֵּד בְּעַם יְהוְה וְאָהָה הוֹשִׁיעֵנוֹ מִיַּד אֹיִבְיוֹ מִסְבִּיב וְזֶה לְדְּ הָאוֹת בִּי-מְשְׁהַדְּ יִהוֹרָה

Here the clause "for a ruler over his people over Israel? And thou shalt rule among the people of the Lord, and thou shalt save them out of the hand of their enemies, and this shall be a sign to thee that the Lord has anointed thee" is omitted. The omission which is due to the homoeoteleuton the Lord the Lord is preserved in the Septuagint.

ז Sam. XIII 15 Heb. מְן־הַגּּלְנָּל מִן־הגלגל וַיֵּלֶךְ לְדַרְכּוֹ וְיָחֶר הָשֶׁם עָלָה אַחֲרֵי שְׁאוּל לִקְרַאת Sept. עם הַמִּלְּחָמָה וַיָּבֹאוֹ מֹן־הַגָּלְנָּל עם הַמִּלְּחָמָה וַיָּבֹאוֹ מֹן־הַגָּלְנָּל

Here the words "and went his way and the remnant of the people went after Saul to meet the men of war and they came out of Gilgal" are omitted. The omitted clause which is due to the homoeoteleuton out of Gilgal.... out of Gilgal is preserved in the Septuagint.

Joshua XXI 36, 37. The omission of these two verses in some MSS, is due to the fact that the following verse begins with the same word, viz. ממשה and out of the tribe of. The transcriber's eye, as is often the case, wandered from one ומשמה verses 36, 37 to the other ומשמה in verse 38, thus skipping over the two verses in question. I have reserved the examination of this omission for the last, both because it is the most instructive illustration in this category and because it requires a more lengthy discussion. The context itself shows that the two verses have been omitted by a clerical error, since without them the enumeration is incomplete. We are expressly told in verse 7 that the Merarites obtained twelve cities, i. e. four from each of the three tribes, Reuben, Gad and Zebulun. The four cities contributed by Zebulun are enumerated (verse 35), so also are the four cities contributed by Gad (verses 38, 39). Now without Reuben and his four cities there are only eight cities instead of twelve as stated in verse 40. In this instance, however, we are not left to conjecture to supply the omission, nor even to the ancient Versions alone. Unlike the former omissions which are attested only by the ancient Versions, this omission is proved by many of the best MSS. and all the early editions. Not only have the Septuagint and the Vulgate these two verses, but they are found in some of the earliest dated MSS., as will be seen from the following description.

Orient. 2201, which is dated A. D. 1246, has the two verses in the text with the vowel-points and accents and with the following remark in the margin: "these two verses are not written in the text of the Codex called Hillali".

The splendid MS. No. 1 in the Madrid University Library, which is dated A.D. 1280, and which is manifestly a Model Codex, has the two verses.

Add. 15250 in the British Museum, a beautiful MS. of about the end of the 13th century, has not only the two verses, but has a Massoretic note against אַר־בָּצֶּר that it occurs (רֹן =) four times. This shows beyond doubt that the School of Massorites from which this note proceeds regarded the two verses as an integral part of the text. For though בַּצֶּר by itself occurs five times (Deut. IV 43; Josh XX 8; I Chron. VI 63; VII 37 and the passage before us), אַרּבָּצֶר with the accusative particle only occurs four times, since in I Chron. VII 37 it is simply בַּצֶּר without the בַּצֶּר אָר.

Besides these Codices, I have to add the following MSS. in the British Museum alone which have the two verses: Arund. Orient. 16; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Add. 15451; Add. 9398; Add. 26897; Harley 1528; Harley 5774; Orient. 1471; Orient. 2369; Orient. 2370; Orient. 2415; Orient. 2626—28; Orient. 4227.

Moreover these two verses are given in the text of all the early editions: The first edition of the Prophets, Soncino 1485—86, has them; so also the first edition of the entire Hebrew Bible, Soncino 1488; the second edition, Naples 1491—93; the third edition, Brescia 1494; the Former Prophets, Pesaro 1511; the Complutensian Polyglot; the first Rabbinic Bible by Felix Pratensis 1517; and in the three quarto editions of Bomberg, Venice 1517, 1521 and 1525. Jacob b. Chayim was the first who omitted these

In Arund. Orient. 16 the two verses are not pointed and the Punctuator has added the following note in the margin: הלה בספר סיני וכספר רבי' נרשם והעתקים מספרים אחרים, ואני מתחרט בכך, אך אין זה מקומן כי אם בר"ה עיקרם אשר מפורש שם מראש העינין, לבני מררי למשפחותם ממטה ראובן וממטה גד וממטה זבולן בגורל ערים שתים עשרה נמצא כאילו נאמר בספר יהושע כי לקחו בני מררי יהצה קדמות דימונה רמות מחנים חשבון יעזר ולקחו עוד ערים אחרות חומת שתים עשרה ובד"ה פירש שמותיהן נמצא כי מ יעזר ולקחו עוד ערים בספר סיני ובספר רב' נרשם ז"ל.

verses in the *editio princeps* of his Rabbinic Bible with the Massorah 1524—25.

The objections raised against the genuineness of these two verses based upon the Massorah, viz. (1) that they are against the Massoretic Summary which gives the number of verses at the end of this book; (2) that their retention in the text is against the Massoretic statement that Isa. XVII 3 is the middle of the 9294 verses contained in the Prophets and (3) that את־קדמות Bezer and את־קדמות Kedemoth are not included in the Massoretic List which tabulates all the instances of את in Josh. XXI וו—37 — all prove that the School, from which these Massoretic remarks proceeded, did not recognise these two verses. Hence, these particular Massorites guarded against them by the remarks in question. The MSS, however, which exhibit these two verses in the text proceed from another and more ancient School of Massorites. The Codices upon which they worked were anterior to the clerical blunder which omitted the verses from the text, as is attested by the ancient Versions. Hence, their Massorah is based upon the existence of these two verses in the text. The analysis in the foregoing chapters of the Sections, Verses, Division of words &c. &c. shows beyond doubt the existence of different Massoretic Schools, with different recensions of the Hebrew text. To adduce, therefore, the arguments derived from one Massoretic School only proves that this particular School worked upon a particular text. These few instances which might easily be multiplied must suffice. Some of them I have given in the marginal notes, and I should have given them all, but for the fact that I had not finished my re-translation of the whole Septuagint into Hebrew when this edition of the Hebrew Bible was being printed.1

Other instances will be found in 1 Sam. XIV 42; XV 13; XVII 36;
 Sam. VI 21; XIII 27, 34; XIV 30; XV 18, 20; XIX 11; 1 Kings II 29;

It is to be remarked that not only does the Septuagint exhibit passages which are omitted in the present Hebrew text due to homoeoteleuta, but it shows that sentences are also omitted in the Septuagint itself arising from the same cause. The following instances will prove this fact:

Here the words "as ye sware unto her" are omitted in the Septuagint because of the homoeoteleuton to her.... to her.

Here the whole of verse 26: "For Joshua drew not his hand back, wherewith he stretched out the spear, until he had utterly destroyed all the inhabitants of Ai", is omitted in the Septuagint because of the homoeoteleuton Ai... Ai at the end of verses 25 and 26.

```
Judg. 111 22, 23 Heb. אהוד
Sept. ייצא אהוד
```

Here the words and the dirt went out are omitted in the Septuagint because of the homoeoteleuton and he went out.... and he went out.

```
ו Sam. XX 26, Heb. מקרה הוא בְּלְתִּי טָהוֹר הוּא מקרה הוּא בּלְתִּי טָהוֹר הוּא מקרה הוּא א
```

Here the words he is not clean are omitted in the Septuagint because of the homoeoteleuton הוא הוא

```
2 Sam. XXIII 28, 29 Heb. הַנְּטֹפְּתִי: חַלֶּב בֶּן־בַּצְנֶה הַנְּטֹפְתִי
הַנְטַפְּתִי: . . . . . . Sept.
```

The first part of verse 29, consisting of the words "Heleb the son of Baanah a Netophathite", is omitted in the

III 27; VIII 65; XVIII 44; 2 Kings XVII 20, 32; XIX 20; XXII 16; Isa. XXII 22 &c. &c.

Septuagint because of the homoeoteleuton Netophathite Netophathite.

These instances too might easily be multiplied. Here, however, it is more difficult to decide whether the authors of the Septuagint had a Hebrew text before them in which these passages were omitted; or whether the translators themselves omitted them owing to the homoeoteleuta. All the passages in this category which I have given in the notes are preceded by care care are preceded by care and care are care are care and care are care are care and care are care are care and care are care and care are care and care are care and care are care are care and care are care are care and care are care are care are care are care and care are care are care and care are care are care are care and care are
¹ Other instances occur in 1 Kings IV 13; VI 31 VIII 41; XV 6; XVI 11; 2 Kings XVI 11; XIX 10, 15; Isa. XLI 14; LXIII 18 &c. &c.

Chap. VII.

The Keri and Kethiv.

In every book of the Massoretic Bible a number of

extraordinary forms are exhibited in the text which are exceedingly perplexing to the student of Hebrew. These abnormal forms and unpronounceable words are produced by the vowel-points which are affixed to certain words, but

by the vowel-points which are affixed to certain words, but which are most inappropriate to the consonants, as will be seen from the following instances: וַיּאמרוֹ (Josh. VI 7),

לְי, תְּהָ מּוֹצִיא (2 Sam. V 2), לְי (2 Sam. XXI 9) שְּלְשָׁים (2 Sam. XXIII 13), אָנֵּר (1 Kings VII 45), אָנַר (Jerem. XLII 6), יְּבָעְתְּהַ (Ezek. IX 11), וּמָתָהַתהַ לְּשָׁיכוֹת (Ezek. XLII 9) יְּבָעְתָּה (Job. XXXVIII 12), בַּן (2 Chron. XI 18) etc. etc. In

some instances there are actually more vowel-points in the text than consonants, and hence these signs are without a consonant. Thus for instance עשה (I Sam. XX 2), מלך (I Kings. XV 18) ו היי (Jerem. XVIII 23) &c. &c.

In Hebrew Grammars the student is told that the vowel-signs which produce these abnormal forms and disfigure the text, do not belong to the words in question, but to other words which are exhibited in the margin and which are the authoritative reading. Accordingly the marginal

variant or the official reading, called the Keri (קרי), is to have the vowel-points, whilst the word written in the text, called technically the Kethiv (בתיב), has no vowel-signs at all. The Massorites, therefore, who have decided that the marginal Keri is the correct one, have in all these instances

deprived us of the vowel-signs which were originally affixed to the words exhibited in the text.

Without entering into a discussion on the merits or demerits of these official various readings as a whole, it is now admitted by the best textual cristics that in many instances the reading exhibited in the text (בתיב) is preferable to the marginal variant (קרי), inasmuch as it sometimes preserves the archaic orthography and sometimes gives the original reading. The Kethiv or textual reading moreover is in many instances not only supported by MSS. and early editions, but by the ancient Versions. As according to the testimony of the Massorah itself, the vowel signs do not in these instances belong to the text, but to the marginal reading, and moreover as the original vowel-signs which did belong to the text have been suppressed altogether, I have left the Kethiv entirely without the vowel-signs, and have given in the margin both the Kethiv and the Keri with their respective vowel-signs. This principle I have adopted in fairness to the Biblical student to afford him an opportunity of judging for himself as to which is the preferable reading. Moreover to aid him in his decision I have in most cases given the MSS., the early editions and the ancient Versions, which support the Kethiv and those which exhibit the Keri. I know that some critics may in sundry cases differ from me as to the proper pointing of the Kethiv, but in the absence of all MS. authority I could do it only according to the best of my judgment.

It is to be remarked that this corpus of official various readings has been transmitted to us in three different forms. (1) Originally each of these variations was given in the margin of the text against the word affected by it. The word in the text was furnished with a small circle or asterisk over it, which directed the reader to

the marginal variant. This ancient practice still prevails in all Massoretic MSS of the Bible and is adopted in all the best editions. (2) Later scribes collected these marginal readings and arranged them in separate Lists which they appended to the respective books in Model Codices.1 These Lists, however, do not always agree in number with those exhibited in the margin and the two classes must frequently be utilized to supplement each other. (3) The third form in which these official variants have been preserved in the Massorah is more artificial, and in some instances more perplexing. The whole corpus of various readings has been classified by the Massorites under different Rubrics. Thus for instance all those which affect the same verb are put together in one Rubric under the same root: 2 those which affect the same particle are collected together in one Rubric:3 all the instances in which the same letter is affected are grouped together 4 &c. &c.

But all the three classes which supplement and control one another, by no means exhaust all the instances embraced under the *Keri* and *Kethiv* hitherto printed, simply because no single MS. contains them all either in the margins, or in the separate Lists which are prefixed and appended to the different Codices. The reason lies in the fact that the different Schools of Massorites were not agreed among themselves in the critical canons which they respectively followed. Hence that which is exhibited as *Keri* in the margin in a MS. proceeding from one School is no *Keri* in the MSS. which emanated from another School and *vice versa*. In order to exhibit, therefore, all the *Keris* irrespective of the different Schools, it is absolutely

¹ This is the case for instance in Arundel Or. 16.

² Comp. The Massorah, letter **x**, § 796, Vol. 1, p. 36, **x** § 843, Vol. 1, p. 91.

³ Comp. The Massorah, letter **x**, §§ 513, 514, Vol. 1, p. 57.

⁴ Comp. The Massorah, letter 77, §§ 26, 27, Vol. 1, p. 268.

necessary to collate all the existing MSS. which at present is almost an impossible task. I have, however, compared as many MSS. both in the public Libraries of Europe, and in the possession of private owners, as were accessible to me, and have, therefore, been able to give a larger number of *Keris* and *Kethivs* than those which are printed in any other edition of the Hebrew Bible.

Chap. VIII.

Sevirin.

The corpus of various readings denoted by the term Sevirin (סביריון) as we shall presently show, is of equal importance to the class of variants comprised in the official Keri (קרי), though it has hardly been noticed by modern critics. Indeed in some respects it is more important than the alternative readings which have hitherto been so scrupulously given in the margin of our Bibles under the name of Keri by modern editors who have either entirely banished the Sevir from the margin or have on extremely rare occasions condescended to notice one of the numerous readings introduced by the name Sevir. Yet in the MSS. the alternate reading entitled Sevir is given in the margin of the text in the same way as the variant described by the term Keri.

To establish the fact that Sevir is really a kind of Keri I have only to mention that the two terms are not unfrequently used interchangeably. The variant which is described in some MSS. as Keri is in other MSS. termed Sevir and vice versa. Thus the oldest Massorah preserved in the St. Petersburg Codex gives us a List of seven passages in which the textual reading or the Kethiv is y unto and the Keri y upon, one of the seven instances is Ezekiel XIII 2, against which the St. Petersburg Codex duly remarks in the margin of the text the Keri is upon. In turning,

¹ Comp. The Massorah, letter &, § 514, Vol. I, p. 57.

of Jacob b. Chayim's Massoretic Bible the Massorah remarks against it: "it is one of the five instances in which the Sevir is "upon." It will thus be seen that the identical variant which is called Keri by one School of Massorites is called Sevir by another School.

Isa. XXX 32 affords a still more striking illustration of the interchangeable use of the terms Sevir and Keri. The Massorah registers three instances in which the textual reading [= Kethiv] is is with her third person singular feminine and the Sevir in each of the three passages exhibits a different reading. In the passage before us the Sevir is with them, the plural masculine. In the Massorah Parva, however, on this very passage this variant is called Keri and the St. Petersburg Codex, which has with her in the text, simply tells us that the Babylonians read with them. The same is the case with the other two instances, viz. Jerem. XVII 24 and Ezek. XIV 4, which are described as Sevirin in this Massoretic Rubric, but which are respectively called Keri in the Massorah Parva.

I shall only adduce one more Massoretic Rubric to illustrate the treatment which the Sevir has been subject to on the part of the School of Massorites who, though bound to give it as an integral portion of the Massorah, have yet passed sentence against it. The Massorah gives a Rubric of two passages where the Sevir is before the children of, and the textual reading is before the face of, viz. Ps. LXXX 3 and Prov. IV 3.3 Instead of Ps. LXXX 3, the Massorah preserved by Jacob b. Chayim

י ה׳ סבירי׳ על.

י בְּהְּ לֹבבּלְאִי Effe Authorised Version follows the Kethiv, the Revised Version the Sevir or Keri.

י לְפְנֵי וֹקְרִי׳ לְפְנֵי (Comp. *Massorah,* letter פּ, § 145, Vol. II, p. 446.

gives Job XIX 7 as one of the two passages and the compilers of this Rubic do not call the instances Sevirin at all, but simply head the Rubric Two verses are misleading. 1 That is, the peculiar wording of the text is misleading, but is not to be exchanged for the normal reading which one would naturally expect. The most remarkable part, however, is the fact that whilst Arundel Or. 16, both on Ps. LXXX 3 and Prov. IV 3, describes them respectively as one of the four and one of the two verses where the Codices are misleading,2 the Massorah Parva in the editio princeps on Prov. IV 3 describes it as one of the Sevirin and the Massorah in Harley 5710-11, which is a model Codex, says it is one of the two passages where the Keri is before the children of. This shows conclusively that whilst one School of Massorites rejected the Sevir as misleading, another School not only regarded it in the same light as the Keri, but actually called it Keri.

From the Lists of variants between the Easterns and Westerns we see that the Scvir was not simply an alternative reading, but it was actually the received reading of the Babylonians. Thus לָּכֶם in Numb. XI 21, viz. "I will give you flesh", which in the Scvir instead of לָּכָּם, i. e. "I will give them flesh", is actually the textual reading of the Eastern School. Again in I Sam. XVIII 25 instead of the simple כִּי אָם, the Scvir is בִּי אַם which is also the received reading of the Easterns."

But we have still further evidence that the *Sevir* refers to the readings of actual MSS, and that these variants are in many instances supported both by still

י מטע' ב' Comp. *The Massorah*, letter בּ, \$ 145, Vol. 11, 446. י מפע' ב' פסו' מפעי לְפָנֵי ב' מסע' בהון ספרי.

³ This is attested by the official List of differences between the Westerns and Easterns in the St. Petersburg Codex dated A. D. 1009, in Add. 15251 and in the *editio princeps*.

extant Codices and by the early editions as well as by the ancient Versions. I must of necessity confine myself to only a few examples in proof of this statement and leave the student to examine for himself the value of each of the hundreds of Sevirin which I have collected from various MSS. and given in the margin of the text against the respective words to which the Sevir refers.

In Genesis XLIX וז the Sevir is שוד unto, instead of the textual reading y upon. Accordingly the passage ought to be rendered "and his border shall be or extend unto Zidon", instead of "and his border shall be upon Zidon". Now the Sevir which gives the intelligeable geographical definition of the territory of Zebulun, is actually the textual reading in many of the MSS. collated by Kennicott and de Rossi. It is also the reading of the Samaritan text, Onkelos in the editio princeps of the Bologna Pentateuch 1482; the edition in the Ixar Pentateuch 1490, the edition in the Lisbon Pentateuch 1461 &c., the Chaldee of the so-called Jonathan, the Septuagint, the Syriac and the Vulgate. The Authorised Version too, exhibits the Sevir, whilst the Revised Version follows the received text.

In Exod. VI 27 the received text has "to bring out the children of Israel from Egypt", whilst the Sevir is מארץ מצרים "from the land of Egypt", as it is in the preceding verse, and the Sevir is not only the textual reading in a number of MSS.,1 but is supported by the Samaritan, the Septuagint and the Syriac.

In Exod. XXV 39 the received text is "of a talent of pure gold (יעשה) shall he make", the third person. The Sevir here is מְעָשֵה "shalt thou make". The second person

¹ When MSS, are quoted without specifying the Library in which they are to be found and their number, the reference is to Kennicott's and Rossi's collations published in Parma 1784 - 88 in 4 Volumes quarto, and the supplement to these volumes also published in Parma in 1798.

is not only demanded by the context, but the *Sevir* is actually the textual reading in several MSS, is exhibited in the Samaritan, in the Chaldee of Onkelos, in the Ixar Pentateuch 1490, in the Septuagint and the Syriac.

The same is the case in Exod. XXVI 31 where the received text has "You the third person, i. e. "shall he make". To avoid the incongruity of this isolated appearance of the third person when all the other verbs throughout the context are in the second person the Authorised Version, which the Revised Version follows, converted the active verb into the impersonal, i. e. shall it be made. Others again who adhere to the literal meaning "shall he make", refer it to the artificer who has suddenly to be brought on the scene, though he is not mentioned at all in these directions. The Sevir, however, is not mentioned at all in these directions, but is the textual reading of several MSS., the Samaritan, the Chaldee in the Ixar Pentateuch 1490, the Septuagint, the Syriac and the Vulgate.

In Numb. XXXIII 8 the received text is "and they journeyed (מְפְּנִי) from before Hahiroth" as the Revised Version correctly renders it. But הַחִירה Hahiroth by itself does not occur. In the only other three passages where this proper name is to be found, it is the compound פִּי הַחִירה Pi-hahiroth.¹ It will be seen that one of the three instances is in the very verse which immediately precedes this one, and to which indeed the verse before us refers, by repeating the name of the place from which the Israelites departed after the encampment was broken up. This is the case throughout the description of the journeyings in this chapter where the verse, which gives the departures simply, repeats the identical name of the place of encampment.

¹ Comp. Exod. XIV 2, 9; Numb. XXXIII 7.

Now the Sevir is מפי החירת from Pi-hahiroth. Here too the Sevir is the textual reading in many MSS., in the Samaritan, the Chaldee, the Septuagint, the Syriac and the Vulgate. The translators of the Authorised Version who adopted the Sevir, also retained the reading of the received text and hence produced the hybrid rendering "and they departed from before Pi-hahiroth".

In Joshua I 15 instead of "which the Lord your God giveth (להם) them" the Sevir is "which the Lord your God giveth (לכם) you", as it is in the second clause. Here again the Sevir is the textual reading in many MSS., in the first edition of the Prophets (Soncino 1485), the first edition of the entire Bible (Soncino 1488), the third edition of the entire Bible (Brescia 1494) and in the Chaldee. It is very remarkable that in some MSS. in which the Sevir is the textual reading, it is actually the subject of a Keri, directing it to be read להם to them.

In ז Kings I ז the received text is "and now (תַעָּהָה) my lord the king" for which the Sevir has "and thou (ואָמָה) my lord the king". This Sevir is not only the textual reading in numerous MSS., but is in the first edition of the Prophets (Soncino 1485), the first edition of the entire Hebrew Bible (Soncino 1488), the Complutensian Polyglot, the Chaldee, the Septuagint, the Syriac and the Vulgate. It is rather remarkable that the Revisers adopted the Sevir as the textual reading, and relegated the received text into the margin. But though this Sevir is so strongly supported by MSS. as the primitive reading, by the early editions and the ancient Versions, yet the Massorah adds to it ומטעים בהון they (i. e. the MSS. or Scribes) are misled thereby, that is in writing אָהה thou instead of now.

In 2 Chron. XXI 2 Jehoshaphat is described as king of Israel (מלך יְשֶׂרְאֵל), whereas he was king of Judah (comp. 1 Kings XXII 41-51). To get over this contra-

diction some have maintained that Israel is here used in the sense of Judah. But whatever may be the secondary sense in which Israel is used, when it is combined with מַלָּדְּ king, it always denotes the sovereign of the ten tribes who constituted the kingdom of Israel in opposition to מֵלֶּדְ יְהוּדָה the king of Judah, whose kingdom consisted of Judah and Benjamin. Here again the Sevir solves the difficulty, inasmuch as it is יהוּרָה Judah, and here too the Sevir is the textual reading in many MSS., in the first edition of the Hagiographa (Naples 1486-87), the Complutensian Polyglot, the Septuagint, the Syriac and the Vulgate. The same applies to the Sevir in 2 Chron. XXVIII 19 which has יהודה Judah, instead of ישראל Israel, since Ahaz was king of Judah and not of Israel. Here again the Sevir is the textual reading in several MSS. and in the editio princeps of the Hagiographa. The various readings are due to the fact that originally the text simply was Yod (') and that this abbreviation was resolved into ישראל Israel, by one School of Massorites and into יהודה Judah, by another School.

Without expanding it into a separate Treatise it is impossible for me to discuss in detail every one of the three hundred and fifty Sevirin which I have succeeded in collecting from the margins of various MSS. The few, however, which I have analysed will sufficiently show the correctness of my contention that according to the testimony both of the MSS. and the ancient Versions the Sevirin in many instances preserve the primitive textual readings. As I have tried to give in every instance the MSS., the editions and the ancient Versions, which support the Sevir on every word where it occurs, the student will henceforth find it an easier task to test the value of this muchneglected class of various readings.

Owing to the fact that the later redactors of the Massorah looked upon the text as finally settled, they

regarded the Sevir with disfavour. Hence the various readings preserved under the name Sevirin, have never been properly collected. Like the official Keri, the extra-official Sevir was originally given in the margin of the text against the word for which it exhibits an alternative reading. Later Scribes, however, collected and grouped together these Sevirin under different headings or Rubrics. In this form each Rubric comprises the number of instances in which the same verb, noun, particle or proper name has the same Sevir, with or without the editorial condemnatory clause that it is misleading (משעין). Jacob b. Chayim was the first who arranged the groups alphabetically in his alphabetical Massorah at the end of the fourth Volume (Venice 1524-25). He, moreover, gives some of the groups in the marginal Massorah on the words which are affected by the Sevir. But he only succeeded in collecting altogether about two hundred Sevirin which indeed is more than could have been expected even from his untiring industry under the extraordinary difficulties which he had to encounter. Frensdorff¹ has simply brought together and alphabetically arranged under a separate Section the Rubrics which are dispersed throughout Jacob b. Chayim's edition of the Massorah. Although Frensdorff has appended to the Sevirin very valuable notes correcting mistakes in the editio princeps of the Massorah yet this indefatigable Massoretic scholar has added no new instances. In my edition of the Massorah I have been able to give a much larger number which I collected from different MSS.2 The continuous collation of new MSS., however, has enabled me to make considerable additions to the Sevirin and the number which now appears in the margin of my Massoretico-

¹ Die Massora magna, Vol. I, p. 369-373, Hannover und Leipzig 1876.

² Comp. The Massorah, letter E, Vol. II, p. 324-329.

ritical edition of the Bible amounts to about 350, or nearly more than half as much again as the number given by Jacob b. Chayim. Nor can even this largely increased number be considered exhaustive. Careful students of MSS. of the Hebrew Bible will discover many new ones. The great difficulty in detecting them arises from the fact that later redactors of the Massorah, owing to their hostility to the Sevir, have often discarded the word שביר with the alternative reading, and simply substituted for it word '' two or three misleading, without giving the variant. The passage which exhibits this nameless sentence in some MSS. has to be carefully compared with the parallel passage in other MSS., where the nature of the Sevir is often given, because the particular Scribe was not possessed by the same degree of hostility to the Sevirin.

As to the treatment of this important corpus of various readings by modern editors of the so-called Massoretic Bible, this is best illustrated by an examination of the three editions which are now accepted by scholars. (1) Hahn's edition of which a new issue has just been published Leipzig 1893. (2) Letteri's edition published by the British and Foreign Bible Society and (3) Dr. Baer's edition of which Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy and Kings are still due. Out of 350 Sevirin Hahn gives two in the margin of his text, viz. 1 Sam. II 16 and XII 5 and these two, Letteris simply repeats from Hahn's edition. In Dr. Baer's edition not a single one of the Sevirin is given in the margin of the text against the words to which the Sevir refers, though this is its proper place by the side of the official Keri as is the case in many of the Massoretic MSS. Dr. Baer, however, notices many of them in the Latin notes which form Appendices to the different books which he edited. But he does not discuss the value of the respective Sevirin, nor does he state

whether they are supported by MSS., the early editions or the ancient Versions. By placing them in the margin of the text, which is a new feature in my edition, I hope to enable the student easily to see the extent and value of this important corpus of various readings.

Chap. IX.

The Western and Eastern Recensions.

As early as the third century we are told that there existed differences between the (מדרבאי) Westerns or Palestinians and the (מערבאי) Easterns or Babylonians which affected not only the orthography, but the exegesis of certain words. We know now that many of the deviating renderings of the Septuagint and the Chaldee Version of the Prophets are due to the variations which obtained in these Schools of textual critics.

An instructive incident affecting the difference in the orthography of the text, which obtained in these Schools is mentioned in the Jerusalem Talmud, where it is related that in Jerusalem the Scribes arbitrarily appended or omitted the He local. To illustrate this fact it is said that they wrote ירושלם instead of ירושלם, likewise אפונה and חימנה instead of חימנה (Jerusalem Megilla I 9).² The Samaritans who adhered to the ancient tradition followed the same practice, which elicited the following censure from Simon b. Elasar: "I said to the Samaritan Scribes: What made you commit this error that you have not adopted the principle of R. Nehemiah?" For it is taught in the name of R. Nehemiah that every word which should have Lamed at the beginning and has is not, must have

¹ Comp. Geiger in the Kerem Chemed IX 69: Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel, p. 481 etc.

¹ אנשי ירושלים היו כותבין ירושלים ירושלימה ולא היו מקפידין ודכותה צפו

צפונה תימן תימנה: מגילה א' מ'.

He appended to it at the end, as for instance חוצה for לחוץ, likewise לסוכות for לשעיר and סוכותה for לסוכות (Jerusalem Jebamoth I 6).

It is very remarkable that though the Samaritan Pentateuch still exhibits some of the peculiarities against which R. Simon here raises his voice, the instances adduced to show the arbitrariness of the Jerusalem Scribes do not exist in the present recension of the Hebrew text. Passages of חימה where it ought to be מים do not occur now, nor have we ירושלמה which should be ירושלמה The only five instances in which should be ירושלמה (I Kings X 2; 2 Kings IX 28; Isa. XXXVI 2; Ezek. VIII 3; 2 Chron. XXXII 9),² the He local is absolutely wanted, inasmuch as it takes the place of the Lamed at the beginning. In this instance, therefore, as is the case with many other features, the process of uniformity has successfully been carried through in so far as the Massoretic text is concerned.

The real nature and extent of the variations between these two Schools of textual critics we must learn from the instances which have been transmitted to us in the official Lists and in the margin of the MSS. against the words on which the variants are recorded. Before entering, however, into an examination of these Schools it is necessary to remark that Madinchai (מרכואי) =) the Easterns is the name for the Jews who resided in Babylon because Babylon lies to the east of Palestine in contradistinction to the Maarbai (מרכאי) = the Westerns which denotes the inhabitants of Palestine. The term Eastern or Madinchai, however, denotes the principal School of Massorites which

י נומתי לסופרי כותים מי גרם לכם למעות דלית אתון דרשון כד' נחמיה דתני בשם ר' נחמיה כל דבר שהוא צריך למ"ד מתחילתו ולא ניתן לו ניתן לו ה"א בסופו כגון לחוץ חוצה לשעיר שעירה לסוכות סוכותה: יבמות א' ו'.

² Comp. The Massorah, letter *, \$ 619 Vol. I, p. 740

was divided into several subordinate Schools; one of these is often quoted by the name Nehardai (נהרדאי) and the other Surai (סוראי) after the names of the cities where the respective Schools were held. The MSS. as a rule and the printed texts exhibit the Maarbai or Western recension.

The Pentateuch. - In the examination and analysis of these variations it is necessary to discuss those which occur in each of the three great divisions of the Bible separately, since some of the official Lists extend to one or two of these divisions and all of them omit the Pentateuch altogether. This omission, however, which is entirely due to the first compiler, has given rise to the assertion on the part of Elias Levita that there is not a single difference between the Easterns and the Westerns in the Pentateuch.1 But this learned expositor of the Massorah, must have overlooked the passage in the editio princeps of Jacob b. Chayim's Rabbinic Bible with the Massorah in praise of which he himself composed a Hebrew poem which is appended to the fourth volume. In the Massorah Magna on Gen. XLVI 20 it is distinctly stated that הובל קין Tubal-Cain (Gen. IV 22) constitutes one of the differences between the Easterns and Westerns, the former read it as one word תובלקין Tubalcain, and the latter read it in two words תובל קין Tubal Cain.2

But though the official Lists do not give the differences which existed in these two Schools of textual critics as far as the Pentateuch is concerned, these variants are given in the margin of different MSS. against the respective passages. It is from these scattered marginal remarks as well as from sundry Massoretic Rubrics that I have collected

¹ Comp. Massoreth Ha-Massoreth, p. 261, ed. Ginsburg, London 1867. הובל קין למדנחאי מילתא חרא בתיב וקריין, למערבאי תרין מלין כתיב וקריין.

the variants in this division of the Hebrew Scriptures. From these sources we learn that the differences between the Eastern and Western recensions are both far more numerous and far more important than those contained in the official Lists.

A few illustrations will suffice to establish this fact. According to the Maarbai (מערבאי) recension which we follow there is no difference in our text between the vowel-points in ממנו from him, third person masculine and from us, first person plural. It is in both instances pointed ממנד. According to the Madinchai (מדנחאי), however, it is মাল্ল Raphe in all the twenty-three passages in which it denotes from us, the first person plural. This fact which we have hitherto only known from MSS. is of double importance. It is in the first place a valuable contribution to Hebrew Grammar, and in the second place it shows that the variations between the Westerns and Easterns extended to the Pentateuch, since nine out of the twentythree instances occur in the Pentateuch.2

Of equal importance is the Massorah Parva in Codex No. 13 in the Vienna Imperial and Royal Court Library on Gen. IV 22. We are here told that according to the Maarbai בית־אָל Beth-el, like הובַל־קין Tubal-cain, הַצָּר־מָוָת Tubal-cain, הַצָּר־מָוָת Hazer-maveth, בֶּל־עָבר Chedor-laomer, and בַּר־לְעָמֵר Gal-ed, is in two words, whereas according to the Madinchai it is ביתאל Bethel one word.3 As this name is to be found no fewer than seventy times in the Hebrew Scriptures it will at once be apparent that its correct orthography is essential,

¹ Comp. The Massorah, letter 2, §\$ 549, 550, Vol. II, page 234.

² Comp. Gen. III 22; XXIII 6; XXVI 16; Exod. I 9; XIV 12; Numb. XIII 31; XXXI 49; Deut. J 28; II 36 3 למדנחאי תובל קין חדא מלה כת' וק', למערבאי ב' מלין וכן חצר מות, וכן

בית אל, וכן כדר לעמר, וכן גַל עד.

especially since Dr. Baer has printed it in one word throughout his text.

The first passage in which this name is mentioned is Gen. XII 8 where it occurs twice. Now besides the Massoretic declaration in the Vienna Codex No. 13 the following MSS. in the British Museum and early editions have it בית־אל Beth-el in two words: Orient. 4445 which is the oldest MS known at present; Orient. 2201 dated A. D. 1246; Harley 1528; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Add. 15282; Orient. 2348; Orient. 2349; Orient. 2350; Orient. 2365; the editio princeps of the Pentateuch, Bologna 1482; the Ixar edition 1490; the Lisbon edition 1491; the second edition of the entire Hebrew Bible, Naples 1491-93; the third edition, Brescia 1494; the Complutensian Polyglot; the first Rabbinic Bible by Felix Pratensis 1517; the quarto Bible, Venice 1521; and the first edition of the Rabbinic Bible with the Massorah by Jacob b. Chayim 1524-25. Three out of the ten MSS., viz. Orient. 2201; Harley 1528; and Orient. 2350 have it actually in two lines, i. e. בית־ Beth at the end of one line and so el at the beginning of the next line. This is also the case in the Complutensian Polyglot. When it is added that Add. 15282 and Orient. 2696 have it לבית אל with the following Massorah נגינה is Mercha, and that the third and fourth editions of the Bible (Naples 1491-93; Brescia 1494) have it here with Mercha, the evidence of its being in two words in accordance with the Maarbai is fully established.

It is, however, to be remarked that in the case of בית־אַל Beth-el as is the case with other words with respect to which the Western and Eastern recensions differ, some. MSS. follow the Madinchai reading. Hence בּיְחָאֵל Bethel in one word is to be found in Arund. Orient. 2; Add. 9401; Add. 15451; Harley 5710—11; Orient. 4227 and in the first

edition of the Hebrew Bible, Soncino 1488. But as we, including Dr. Baer, profess to follow the *Maarbai*, the deliberate ejection of בית־אל Beth-el from the text, especially when with one exception it is in all the early editions, is to be deprecated.

The treatment of בְּרֶר־לְעָמֶר Chedor-laomer, the fourth name in the Rubric which registers the variations between these two Schools of textual critics, is still more remarkable and illustrative of the fact that the Maarbai recension is not uniformly followed in all the MSS. or editions. As this name occurs five times and in the same Section, and moreover as it is treated differently by the same MSS. and editions, it will be more convenient to examine each passage separately.

(ו) In Gen. XIV I where it first occurs, the following MSS. and editions have it לְּלֶבֶר Chedor-laomer in two words according to the Maarbai: Arund. Orient. 2 dated A. D. 1216; Harley 5710—11; Add. 15451; Orient. 4227; Orient. 2365; the editio princeps of the Pentateuch, Bologna 1482; the first edition of the entire Bible, Soncino 1488; the third edition, Brescia 1494; the Complutensian Polyglot; the first edition of the Rabbinic Bible by Felix Pratensis 1517; the Venice quarto 1521, and the first edition of the Bible with the Massorah by Jacob b. Chayim 1524—25. It is to be remarked that Harley 5710—11 which is one of the most beautiful and accurate MSS. and is evidently a Standard Codex, has it not only in two words, but in two lines, 712 Chedor is at the end of one line and domer begins the next line.

The following MSS. and editions have it בְּדְרְלְשְׁמֶר Chedorlaomer in one word according to the Madinchai: Orient. 4445 which is the oldest MS. known at present; Orient. 2201 dated A. D. 1246; Add. 9401 dated A. D. 1286; Harley 1528; Add. 15251; Orient. 2348; Orient. 2349; Orient. 2350; Orient. 2626–28; the Lisbon Pentateuch 1491 and the second edition of the entire Bible, Naples 1491–93. It is also to be added that Add. 15251, which has it in one word has against it in the margin here מלה חדא = one word.

(2) In Gen. XIV 4 the following MSS. and editions have it בְּרֵר־לְּעָהֶר Chedor-laomer in two words in accordance with the Western recension: Arund. Orient. 2; Harley 5710—11; Add. 15451; Orient. 4227; Orient. 2365; the Bologna Pentateuch 1482; the first and third editions of the Bible, Soncino 1488, Brescia 1494; the Complutensian Polyglot; the first edition of the Rabbinic Bible by Felix Pratensis 1517; and the Venice quarto 1521. Moreover Orient. 4227 as also the editions of 1494, 1517 and 1521 have it in two lines, viz. לְּעָהֶר Chedor at the end of one line and לְּבָרַר at the beginning of the next line.

The following MSS. and editions have it בְּדַרְלְּעָמֶר Chedorlaomer in one word in accordance with the Eastern recension: Orient. 4445; Orient. 2201; Add. 9401; Harley 1528; Add. 15251; Orient. 2348; Orient. 2349; Orient. 2350; the Lisbon edition of the Pentateuch 1491; the second edition of the Bible 1491—93 and the first edition of the Rabbinic Bible with the Massorah by Jacob b. Chayim 1524—25. It is remarkable that Jacob b. Chayim who has it in two words in all the other four passages has it in one word in this solitary instance.

(3) In Gen. XIV 5 the following MSS. and editions have it בְּרַר־לְּעָבֶּר Chedor-laomer the reading of the Maarbai: Arund. Orient. 2; Add. 9401; Harley 5710—11; Add. 15451; Add. 15250; Orient. 4227; Orient. 2365; the Bologna edition of the Pentateuch 1482; the first and third editions of the Bible, Soncino 1488, Brescia 1494; the Complutensian Polyglot; Felix Pratensis Rabbinic Bible 1517; the Venice quarto Bible 1521; and the first edition of the Bible with the Massorah

by Jacob b. Chayim 1524—25. — Add. 9401 and the editions of 1494, 1517 and 1521 have it in two lines. Now on comparing the MSS. quoted under Nos. 1 and 2 it will be seen that Add. 9401, which follows the Eastern recension in these two instances, not only exhibits in the passage before us the Western reading, but has it in two lines, בוֹר Chedor at the end of one line and לְּעָבֶּר laomer at the beginning of the next line.

The following MSS. and editions exhibit the Eastern recension בְּדְרִלְּעָהֶר Chedorlaomer in one word: Orient. 4445; Orient. 2201; Harley 1528; Add. 15251; Orient. 2348; Orient. 2349; Orient. 2350; Orient. 2626—28; the Lisbon edition of the Pentateuch 1491; and the second edition of the Bible, Naples 1491—93.

- (4) In Gen. XIV 9 the same MSS and editions follow respectively the Western and Eastern recensions as exhibited in No. 3. Here again Add. 9401 not only follows the Western reading, but has it in two separate lines as in No. 3, though in Nos. 1 and 2, the Eastern reading is adopted.
- (5) Gen. XIV 17 which is the fifth instance where this name occurs, exhibits no peculiarities, the same six MSS. and the same seven early editions which follow the Western recension in No. 4 follow it here, and the same seven MSS. and two early editions have the Eastern reading.

Delitzsch in his Preface to Dr. Baer's edition of the Five Megilloth, prints a Massorah which reverses the Schools whence this divergent reading emanates. It is the Eastern recension we are here told which reads בְּרֶר-לְשָׁבֶּר Chedor-laomer in two words, whilst the Western reads its בּרֶרלִשְּׁבֶּר Chedorlaomer in one word.¹ As this Rubric was

י אלין פלוגתא, כדרלעמר, שלהבתיה, ובזיותיה, בשפרפרא, למדנחאי תורתין אלין פלוגתא, כדרלעמר, שלהבתיה, Comp. Preface to the חדה כתיבן, p. V, Leipzig 1886.

communications from my experience of the manner in which he manipulates Massorahs. If this Rubric, however, is a faithful transcript from a MS. it only shows what I have often contended for, that similar Massorahs are not only based upon distinct recensions of the text, but that the same Rubric or reading is sometimes transmitted to us in the names of opposite Schools of textual critics.

As regards the remaining thirty-one variations which I have given in the notes, they are as follows: (1) Gen. X 19 is in Or. 2696, British Museum.

(2)

and in Add. 15251, British Museum. XLIII 29 is in the National Library Paris (3)

XXVIII 3 is in the Madrid Codex No. 1;

Codex No. 1-3. XVII 4 is in Norzi's Minchath Shai on (4) Exod. this passage.

16 is in the National Library Paris (5)Codex No. 1-3. VII 16 is in the National Library Paris (6) Levit. Codex No. 1-3.

XII 6 is in the St. Petersburg Codex (7)dated A.D. 916, Jer. XXV 12.

4 is in the National Library Paris (8)XIII77 Codex No. 1-3.

(9)"

7 is in the National Library Paris Codex No. 1-3. XIV 12 is in the National Library Paris (10)

Codex No. 1-3. XVI 33 is in Norzi's Minchath Shai on (11)"

this passage.

206		Introduction. CHAP. IX.
	(12) Levit.	XXVII 24 is in Orient. 2626, British Mu-
		seum; and in the Codex
		Leicester, fol. 62b.

CHAP. IX.

	Leicester, fol. 62 b.
(13) Numb.	I 48 is in Orient. 2626.
(14) "	XI 21 is in de Rossi in loco.
(15) "	XIII 6 is in the National Library Paris
	Codex No. $1-3$.

Codex No. 1-3. XXII 37 is in the National Library Paris (16)

Codex No. 1-3. XXVI 33 is in the National Library Paris (17)Codex No. 1-3.

XXX 13 is in the National Library Paris (18)Codex No. 1-3.

XXXII 7 is in Harley 5710-11, British (19)" Museum.

XXXIV 19 is in the National Library Paris (20)Codex No. 1-3.

I 11 is in the National Library Paris (21) Deut. Codex No. 1-3. (22)

" 28 is in the National Library Paris Codex No. 1-3. (23)

XVI 3 is in the National Library Paris Codex No. 1-3. (24)

XVII 10 is in the National Library Paris Codex No. 1-3. 12 is in Orient. 4445, British Mu-(25)seum.

(26)"

XIX 16 is in the National Library Paris Codex No. 1-3. XXXI 27 is in the National Library Paris (27)

Codex No. 1-3. XXXII 6 is in de Rossi in loco. (28)

35 is in the National Library Paris (29)" Codex No. 1-3.

- (30) Deut. XXXII 39 is in the National Library Paris
 Codex No. 1--3.
- (31) , XXXIII 5 is in the National Library Paris

 Codex No. 1—3.

The Former Prophets. - For this division of the Hebrew Bible I have collated the following official Lists: (1) The St. Petersburg Codex B 19a dated A. D. 1000 which gives the Lists for all the Prophets and the Hagiographa. (2) Codex No. 1 in the Madrid University Library dated A. D. 1280. This MS. gives the List for Kings only; the variations in Joshua, Judges and Samuel are given in the Margin on the respective passages, thus forming part of the Massorah Parva. (3) The beautiful little MS. in 16 volumes 12^{mo} dated A. D. 1487 in the Madrid Royal Library which, with the exception of Psalms and Chronicles, gives the Lists for the Prophets and the Hagiographa. (4) The MS. kindly lent me by the late Dr. Merzbacher of Munich which gives the Lists for the Prophets and Hagiographa. (5) Bodley MS. No. 10-11 which also gives the Lists for the Prophets and the Hagiographa. (6) Arund. Orient. 16 British Museum which gives the Lists at the end of each book and (7) Add. 15251 which gives the Lists for the Former Prophets only. These MS. Lists together with the Lists in the editio princeps in Jacob b. Chayim's Bible with the Massorah I have carefully collated. Of course there must be other MSS, which have these Lists, but to which I have not had access.

With the exception of more or less clerical errors these Lists are simply copies of one another and add very little to the extensive differences which we know from the MSS. themselves, have existed between the Western and Eastern recensions of the text. The slavishness with which the Scribes copied one another may be seen from the fact that the Scribe of the List dated A. D. 1009 has the instance

from Ezra X 3 out of its proper place, since he put it as the last in the List after Neh. XIII 10 and all the other MSS. and even the *editio princeps* follow suit in this disorder.

Joshua. — In Joshua I have obtained four new variations between these two Schools from the MSS., viz. VIII 16; X 1; XXIII 15 and XXIV 15. The first is from Codex No. 1-3 in the National Library Paris, and Add. 15251, British Museum, whilst the remaining three are in the Paris Codex alone. Dr. Baer gives the following six variations:

(1)	ш	4	למדנ' וּבֵינָיו כתיב וקרי
(2)	\mathbf{IV}	18	למדני בַּעַלות כתיב וקרי
(3)	VI	15	למדני בַּעלות כתיב, בַעלות קרי
(4)	VII	I	למער׳ בָּבְנֵי ישראל, למדנ׳ בִּישראל
(5)	$\mathbf{x}v$	22	למרני ועדיעדה בי מלין
(6)	xv	20	למדג' ואליתכז ב' מליז

These I have not adopted because I could not verify them. Those variations which Dr. Baer in his List ascribes to the Easterns and which I could verify, viz. יְיָנִים כְּהִי (אַנִים כְּהִי) אַנְייִם כְּהִי (אַנִים כְּהִי (אַנִים כְּהִי (אַנִים בְּהִי (אַנִים כְּהִי (אַנִים כְּהִי (אַנִים בְּהִי (אַנִים בְּהִי (אַנִים בְּהִי (אַנִים בְּהִי (אַנִים בְּהִי (אַנִים בְּהִי (אָרִים בְּהִי (אַנִים בְּהִי (אַנִים בְּהִיי (אָנִים בְּהִיי (אַנִים בְּיִּבְּיִּים בְּהִיי (אַנִים בְּהִיי (אָּנִים בְּהִיי (אָבִיי בְּיִּבְּיִים בְּהִיי (אָנִים בְּהִיי (אָנִים בְּיִנִים בְּהִיי (אָּבִּיי בְּיִּבְּיִים בְּיִּינִים בְּיִים בְּיִים בְּיוֹי בְּיוֹי בְּיוֹי בְּיוֹים בְּיִינִים בְּיוֹי בְּיוֹים בְּיוֹי בְּיוֹים בְּיִינִים בְּיוֹי בְּיוֹים בְּיוֹי בְּיוֹים בְּיוֹי בְּייִים בְּיִים בְּיוֹים בְּיוֹים בְּיוֹי בְּיוֹי בְּיוֹים בְּיִיים בְּיִים בְּיוֹים בְּיוֹים בְּיִים בְּיוֹים בְּיוֹים בְּיוֹים בְּייִים בְּייִים בְּיִים בְּיִּים בְּיִים בְּיִּים בְּיִים בְּיִים בְּיִים בְּיִים בְּיִים בְּיִים בְּיִים בְּיִים בְּיים בְּיים בְּייִים בְּיוּים בְּיּים בְּייִים בְּיּים בְּיִים בְּיים בְּיוֹים בְּיוּבְיים בְּיּים בְּיוּים בְּיוֹים בְּיוּבְיים בְיים בְּיּים בְּיים בְּיּים בְּיים בְּיים בְּיים בְּיוֹים בְּיוֹים בְּיים בְּיים בְּיים בְּיים בְּיים בְּיים בְּיוֹים בְּיוֹים בְּ

Two, viz. בשופרות VI 20 and יְאֶל־חּוֹלֵך XV 30; XIX 4 in two words, are simply various readings. The former is in the text in Orient. 2201 which is one of the best MSS. and is dated A. D. 1246; in the editio princeps; the first edition of the entire Bible, Soncino 1488; the Former Prophets, Pesaro 1511; the first edition of the Rabbinic Bible by Felix Pratensis 1517; and in the first edition of the Bible with the Massorah by Jacob b. Chayim 1524-25. The latter is in Harley 5710—11 and in all the early editions.

As to VIII א שיר שור Dr. Baer says is לְעִיר of the city, in both parts of the verse according to the Westerns, but

according to the Easterns it is only the Kethiv or the textual reading which has it in both clauses, whilst the Keri is לעי of the city, no official Lists, MSS., Massorahs, or early editions which I have seen have any variation on this verse. Both the MSS. and the Lists which exhibit any variation at all, not only mark it on לְעִיר of the city, in verse 12, but vary in their statements as to the nature of the difference and as to the School to which it belongs. This will be seen from the following analysis of the Massorah Parva: (1) Orient. 2201 which is dated A. D. 1246 and Harley 1528 have in the text in VIII 12 לעיר of the city, and in the margin against it לָעִי קי the Keri is of Ai. The same is the case in Harley 5710-11 where the Massorah Parva has against this verse לכל the Resh is to be cancelled = the Keri is לְעֵי of Ai, thus treating it as an ordinary Keri of the Western School. (2) Arund. Orient. 16 and Add. 15451 which are superb MSS., have no Keri at all, but simply remark against it in verse 12 ד' דמטע' four times misleading, which is the condemnatory appellation for Sevirin.

Equally certain is verse 12 indicated in the official Lists, which tabulate the differences between the Westerns and the Easterns. I must first notice the fact that the two oldest official Lists, viz. the St. Petersburg Codex dated A. D. 1009 and the Madrid Codex No. 1, record no difference whatever either in verse 12 or 13. The Lists, however, which register this difference not only assign it to verse 12, but remark that according to the Westerns it is ישיר of the city, in two verses both in the Kethiv and in the Keri, whilst according to the Easterns the Kethiv in these two verses is ישיר of the city [or ישיר city], but the Keri is ישיר of Ai or ישיר און, viz. verses 12 and 16.2 To the

י למער׳ לָעִיר כתיב וקרי, תרויהון דפסוק, למדנ׳ לעיר כתיב, לָעַי קרי. 2 למער׳ ב׳ פסוקין כת׳ לָעִיר וכן קר׳, למדנ׳ לַעִיר כת׳ לַעַי קר׳.

same effect are the official Lists in Arund. Orient. 16; Add. 15251; Bodley No. 11, the MS. in the Royal Library Madrid; Codex Merzbacher; and in the editio princeps. Having altered ז'ב two verses, into הרויהון דפסוק in both clauses of the verse, Dr. Baer was obliged to palm it on verse 13, since it is the only verse in this Section where לְּעִיר of the city occurs twice.

Dr. Baer gives וימיתם Josh. X 26, as the passage which constitutes the difference between the Westerns and Easterns, whereas the official List in the St. Petersburg Codex dated A. D. 1009 gives ואת כל המלכים לכך ויכם as the catchword which is XI 17 and the official Lists in the other MSS. confirm it.

In three instances, viz. VIII 12; XVIII 14 and XXII 18 the Chaldee exhibits the Eastern recension. On VIII 12 my note מכרים כ"י ותרי is to be corrected into וכן במקצת ספרים. וכן במקצת.

Judges. — In Judges I have been able to add from Codex No. 1—3 in the National Library Paris the important fact that verses 29 and 30 in chapter VIII are one verse according to the Easterns.

This implies a different accentuation as well as different numbering of the verses in this book. In two instances, viz. I 21 and XX 36 the Chaldee exhibits the Eastern readings. Of the five passages which Dr. Baer includes in his List one (VIII 22) is a *Sevir*, and the other four (VI 25; X 4; XV 5; XX 20) are various readings exhibited in the text of our recensions.

Samuel. — In Samuel I have only found one new variation which constitutes a difference between the Westerns and Easterns, viz. 1 Sam. XVIII 25 where the Oriental reading is עָרְלֹת This is given in the official List in Arund. Orient. 16. As regards the other difference in this verse, the oldest List in the St. Petersburg Codex dated A. D. 1009 distinctly gives it as follows:

למע' כי במאה ערלות פלש' למדנ' כי אָם־במאה ערלות

It will thus be seen that the difference between these two Schools is the absence and presence of the particle in the text. This is confirmed by the List in Add. 15251 and in the *editio princeps*. Dr. Baer's statement, therefore, that the Eastern variation is

כי אָם־במאה כתיב, כי במאה קרי

is to be rejected.

Equally wrong is Dr. Baer's manipulation of a supposed difference between these two Schools in I Sam. XIX 23 which he formulates as follows:

למע׳ בְּנֶיוֹת כתיב וקרי למרנ׳ בנוית כתיב, בְּנֵיוֹת קרי.

All the best MSS. and early editions give this Kethiv and Keri as belonging to the Western recension. They have הבנית in the text and against it in the margin 'בְּנִיוֹת ק'. This is the case in Orient. 2201; Harley 5710—11; Arund. Orient 16; Add. 15451; and Add. 15251, all of which are Standard Codices. The second and third editions of the entire Bible (Naples 1491—93; Brescia 1494); the Former Prophets, Pesaro 1511 and the Rabbinic Bible by Felix Pratensis 1517, as well as the quarto Bible, Venice 1521 exhibit בנוית in the text with the vowel points of the Keri which is their usual way of indicating the Keri, whilst the editio princeps of the Rabbinic Bible with the Massorah by Jacob b. Chayim 1524—25 has בניות לי in the text and against it in the margin 'בניות ק'.

As to the other eleven instances which Dr. Baer exhibits in his List as constituting variations between these two Schools, five I was unable to verify (I Sam. XIX 13; XX 33; 2 Sam. XIII 5; XXII 45; XXIII 31) and, therefore, hesitated to accept them. The six instances, however, which

וְעַתַּה וְאָתַה פּליג

I could test do not belong to this category of variations. They are given on the authority of Codex Reuchlin No. 2 where the Massorah Parva's remark against each of them is as follows:

(1) ו Sam. XIX 13 אֶל־המטה עַל־ פּלינ (2) ... XXII 6 אָתוֹ עָמוֹ פּלינ (3) ... XXIV 4 על־הדרך אֶל־ פּלינ (4) ... XXVII 19 בַּבְּרָק פּלינ (5) 2 Sam. III 29 אַל־ פּלינ (10 בַּלִּיבּל וְעַל־ פּלינ (11 בַּלַי עַלַּי פּלינ (11 בַלַי עַלַּי פּלִינ (11 בַּלַי עַלִּי עַלַּי עַלְיבָּי בּלִינ עַלְי עַלְיבָּי עַלְיבָּי עַבְּיִי עַלְיבָּי עַלְיבָּי עַלְיבָּי עַלְיבָּי עַבְּיבּי עַבְּיִי עַבְּיבּי עַבְּיבּי עַבְּיבָּי עַבְּיבָּי עַבְּיבָּי עַבְּיבָּי עַבְּיבָּי עַבְּיבָּי עַבְּיבָּי עַבְּיבָּי עַבְּיבָּיי עַבְּיבָּיִי עַבְּיבָּיי עַבְּיבָּי עַבְּיבָּיי עַבְּיבָּי עַבְּיבָּיי עַבְּיבָּיי עַבְּיבָּיי עַבְּיבָּי עַבְּיבָּי עַבְּיבָּי עַבְּיבָּי עַבְּיבָּיי עַבְּיבָּי עַבְּיבָּיי עַבְּיבָּיי עַבְּיבָּיי עַבְּיבָּיי עַבְּיבָּיי עַבְּיבָּיי עַבְּיבָּיי עַבְּיבָּיי עַבְּיבָּייי עַבְּיבָּיי עַבְיבָּייי עַבְּיבָּיי עַבְּיבָּייי עַבְּיבָּייי עַבְּיבָּייי עַבְּיבָּיי עַבְּיבָּיי עַבְּיבָּייי עַבְּיבָּייי עַבְּיבָּייי עַבְּיבָּייי עַבְּיבָּייי עַבְּיבָּייי עַבְּיבָּייי עַבְּיבָיי עַבְּיבּייי עַבְּיבּייי עַבְּיבָייי עַבְּיבָּיי עַבְּיבָּייי עַבְּיבָּייי עַבְּיבָּייי עַבְּיבָייי עַבְּיבּייִיי עַבְיבָּייי עַבְּיבְיבָייי עַבְּיבְיבָּייי עַבְיבָּיייי עַבְּיבָּייי עַבְּיבָּייי עַבְיבָּיבָייי עַבְּיבָּייי עַבְּיבָייִיי עַבְּיבּייי עַבְּיבָּייי עַבְּיבּייי עַבְּיבָּיייי עַבְּיבָיי עַבְּיבָּייי עַבְּיבָייי עַבְּיבָּייי עַבְּיבָּיייי עַבְּיבָּיייי עַבְּיייי עַבְּיבָּיייי עַבְיייי עַבְּיבָּיייי עַבְּיייי עַבְיייייייי עַבּייייייי עַבְיייייייייי עבּייייי עבּיייייייי עבּייייייייי עבּייייייייי עבּיייייי ע

VII 25

(6)

It will thus be seen that Dr. Baer takes פלינ or as the equivalent for מלונתא = Eastern, which it most assuredly is not. The expression is of frequent occurrence in the Massorah and it simply denotes there is a difference of opinion here, or a variation, which may either be exhibited in the MSS. or in special Codices revised by known textual critics. Thus on עלה burnt offerings Exod. XXIV 5 the Massorah Parva remarks פלונתי עלות a variation עלות, which simply means that in some MSS. it is plene. On ענלת wagons Numb. VII 3 the Massorah Parva explains this technical expression by adding: "It is three times defective in this Section [Numb. VII 3, 6, 8], but there is a difference of opinion about it since some say it is here ענלות plene".1 It will thus be seen that the Massorah itself explains פליג or פלוגתא by some say, or some hold a different opinion, i. e. certain textual critics say it is plene, or some MSS. exhibit the plene form.

On ציְּדָה venison Gen. XXVII 3 for which the Keri is קוֹליג ביה the Massorah in Add. 15251 remarks ופליג ביה, but there is a variation here, that is some MSS. or textual critics have no Keri. That this is the meaning of פליג is, moreover, evident from the expanded Massorah in the

editio princeps on this very passage which is as follows: "the He is superfluous, but it is a variant of R. Nachman", i. e. according to this textual critic the He is not redundant, but is as in Josh. IX וו and Ps. LXXVIII 25. Here we have a clear proof that the simple לוב in one MS. is in another Massorah described as a variation of a particular reductor. Unless, therefore, מלינ is followed by the name of the individual or of the School to whom or to which the variation belongs it is most unjustifiable to take it as an equivalent for "מונים the Eastern School."

The following two readings of the Madinchai are exhibited in the text of the Chaldee I Sam. IV 15 and 2 Sam. XIII 33. In the variations of these two Schools I have inadvertently omitted 2 Sam. VI 19 where the Westerns read מַאָּיִישׁ and the Easterns שׁי without Lamed.3

Kings. — In Kings I have added the following five variations which are not contained in the editio princeps.

(1) I Kings III 12 which is given in the Massorah Parva in Orient. 2626—28. (2) III 26 which is in the List of the St. Petersburg Codex dated A. D. 1009. (3) XVI 19 which is in the List of the same Codex. (4) XX 43 which is in the St. Petersburg Codex dated A. D. 9164 and (5) 2 Kings X 31 which is in the List of Add. 15251. I can now add a sixth instance, viz. מולליהם and their children 2 Kings VIII 12 which according to the Easterns is plene, as will be seen from Massorah Parva in Harley 5710—11 on Ps. XVII 14.

ו ה' יתיר' אכל פלוגת' דרב נחמן.

² If any other proof were needed I have simply to point out the fact that ימו in I Sam, XXII 6 which is described as מליג is actually given as א"ם in Harley 5710—II, whilst יְעֵל־ 2 Sam III 29 is not only one of the Seviring but is exhibited in the text of Arund. Orient. 16.

³ Comp. The Massorah, letter x, § 442a, Vol. I, p. 52.

⁴ Comp. the St. Peterburg Codex on Ezek. XIII 2, and *The Massorah*, letter **8**, § 514, Vol. I, p. 57.

The Massorah here tells us that according to the Easterns with the suffix third person plural masculine is plene in all the four instances in which it occurs, 1 viz. 2 Kings VIII 12; Isa. XIII 16; Hos. XIV 1; and Ps. XVII 14. In our or Western recension, however, it is only plene in one instance (Ps. XVII 14). Hence we obtain three more passages than we have hitherto known (2 Kings VIII 12; Isa. XIII 16; and Hos. XIV 1) which exhibit differences between the Eastern and Western recensions.

I. From these MS. Lists and the MSS, themselves I have also been able to make the following corrections. Though the official Lists in the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 1009, in the Madrid Codex of the Royal Library, in Bodley No. 11, in the Merzbacher MS., in Add. 15251 British Museum and in the editio princeps distinctly state that ו ישינה I Kings III 20 is plene according to the Westerns and that according to the Eastern School it is ישנה defective, yet some of the best MSS., and all the early editions have the defective form in the text. But as we invariably follow the Western recension I have given the plene in the text and the variant in the margin in accordance with the uniform practice. The MSS. and the editions, however, demonstrate the fact to which I have often had occasion to advert that the Eastern reading and not the Western is not unfrequently exhibited both in the MSS. and editions.

II. The variation which the Massorah Parva in the editio princeps places against I Kings XVI I belongs to verse 12 of the chapter in question. This is not only attested by the official Lists in the MSS., but by the List in the editio princeps itself where the proper catchword is given למע' וישמד זמרי = XVI 12.

III. In I Kings XVII 4 the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 1009 reverses the variation, giving there, as the Western recension and with the paragogic He as the Eastern reading. But as all the other Lists distinctly state the contrary there must be a clerical error in the St. Petersburg List.

In four passages the Chaldee exhibits the text of the Eastern recension, viz. 1 Kings XVI 12; 2 Kings XVIII 37; XIX 9, 20.

The Latter Prophets. — With the exception of Add. 15251 which gives the Lists for the Former Prophets only, all the Lists which I have collated for the Former Prophets I also examined for this division of the Bible. I have, moreover, carefully collated the text of the Babylonian or St. Petersburg Codex dated A. D. 916 which embraces this portion of the Hebrew Scriptures and which is supposed to exhibit the text of the Eastern recension. Whether this claim put forward on the part of Biblical scholars is justified or not will be seen from a comparison of the Eastern variants as transmitted to us in the official Lists and in the Margins of the MSS. with the readings in the text of this Codex.

Isaiah. — From the official List in the St. Petersburg Codex dated A. D. 1009 I have been able to add two new instances, viz. III 24 and XIV 26. The first instance shows that קוֹלְה girdle Isa. III 24, which according to the Westerns is defective, ought to be in the text, since we follow the Maarbai recension. This reading is actually in the text in some of the best MSS., viz. Orient. 2201 dated A. D. 1246; Harley 5710—11; Harley 1528; Add. 15250; and Orient. 2626—28, as well as in the Complutensian Polyglot. Arund. Orient. 16, however, Add. 15451; Add. 15251; Add. 15252,

¹ This MS. remarks on it in the Massorah Parva ב' מל' = twice plene, but as תְּנֶרָה is unquestionably defective in the second instance where it occurs,

as well as all the early editions with the exception of the Complutensian Polyglot, have הַנוֹרָה plene in the text which is the Eastern reading. We have here, therefore another proof of the fact, so often adverted to, that the MSS. and the early editions which profess to follow the readings of the Maarbai not unfrequently exhibit the Madinchai recension.

From the Massorah Parva in Orient. 2201 I have also been able to increase the number by three more instances. On Isa. XXVII 8 this Massorah informs us that the Babylonians = Easterns read בַּרוֹחַ, that they read מַלְאָן in XXXVII 36 and that they read מַלְאָן in XXXVII 13. I am now able to add a sixth instance, viz. מַלְלִיהֶם Isa. XIII 16 which according to the Easterns is מְלֵלִיהֶם plene.¹ Orient. 2201; Harley 5710—11; and Add. 15451, as well as the Lisbon edition of Isaiah 1492 and the Complutensian Polyglot have the plene form in the text, thus affording another illustration of the fact that the Eastern recension is often exhibited in the text of some of the best MSS. and editions which profess to follow the Western recension.

As regards the St. Petersburg Codex dated A. D. 916 which some critics maintain exhibits the text of the Oriental recension, this can best be tested by a comparison of the Eastern readings transmitted to us in the official Lists and in the Massorahs with the readings in this MS. In this examination I shall confine myself more especially to Isaiah since the result of this investigation will equally apply to Jeremiah, Ezekiel and the Minor Prophets which constitute the rest of this remarkable Codex.

The official Lists and the MSS. give thirty-one passages in Isaiah in which the Easterns have a different reading

viz. 2 Kings III 21 and, moreover, as it is so written in this very Codex מל' ב' מל' is manifestly a mistake.

¹ See above pp. 213, 214.

from the Westerns. Of these the St. Petersburg Codex in question exhibits only fifteen, whereas in the other sixteen instances this Codex follows the Western readings.

From the fact that the St. Petersburg Codex has half the number of the Eastern readings, no valid argument can be adduced that the MS. exhibits the text of the Eastern recension, especially when it is borne in mind that even the acknowledged Western MSS. often exhibit in the text the readings of the Eastern School. All that can be fairly inferred is that at this early period the Massorites and those textual critics who were engaged in the redaction of MSS. did not as yet minutely classify the various readings of the two Schools.

Besides the fifteen variations in the St. Petersburg Codex which happen to agree with the Eastern recension, it has no fewer than two hundred other readings which differ from the Western text in Isaiah alone. As far as I know no critic has as yet been bold enough to assert that these two hundred exhibit the differences between the Eastern recension and the Western text. With such a vast number of variations it would indeed be surpassing strange if a small proportion did not agree with the Eastern School the text of which was only in the process of being separated from the recension of the Western School.

Codex Heidenheim remarks in the Massorah Parva on Isa. XX 2 that it is two verses according to the Easterns,³ yet the St. Petersburg Codex not only reads it as one verse, but emphatically states in the Massorah that the

¹ Isa. VI 13; XIV 26; XXIII 12, 12; XXVII 6; XXXVII 9; XLIV 27; XLIX 5; LI 7; LIII 4; LIX 4, 9, 11; LXIV 6; LXVI 2.

² Isa. III 17, 24; XIII 16; XIV 19; XX 2; XXI 14; XXIII 12; XXXVII 8; XXXVIII 14, 14; XLV 18; XLVI 8; LVI 3, 7; LVII 10; LIX 6.

218 Introduction.

textual reading is according to the Westerns who connect the two verses into one.¹

The St. Petersburg Codex reads מוֹל with them, in the text in Isa. XXX 32 and remarks in the Massorah Parva that according to the Easterns it is אין with her, thus showing that it designates its text as exhibiting the Western recension and hence gives the alternative Eastern reading in the margin (בה לבבלי).

The conclusion, therefore, which we may legitimately draw from these facts is that this Codex neither exhibits a distinctive Eastern nor a definite Western recension, but that it is a mixture of the two recensions which obtained prior to the time when the texts of the two Schools were more sharply divided. To adduce, therefore, a variant from this Codex alone in order to prove an Eastern reading is to be deprecated, unless indeed the variant is expressly described as such in other MSS., and unless we are prepared to describe all the hundreds of various readings in this MS. as Eastern in contradistinction to the Western recension.

For this reason the following passages which Dr. Baer gives in his Lists and in the Prefaces to the various parts of his editions and some of which I have adopted, as differences between the Westerns and the Easterns, must be taken as simply exhibiting ordinary variants.

In Isa. XVIII 2, 7 the St. Petersburg Codex reads property in two words as it is in the ordinary MSS. and editions. It has, however, against it in the Massorah Parva the Kethiv is one word and the Keri two words, in spite of the fact that the Kethiv here exhibits two words. This variant which I have not as yet been able to find in any

ו ליפין מער׳.

ים קרים חד כתי ובתרין קרי. ²

other MS. is not to be taken as exhibiting a difference between the two Schools, but must be regarded as an ancient *Kethiv* and *Keri*. My note on this passage is, therefore, to be corrected into כם"א קוקו חד כת' קו־קו תרין ק'.

In Isa. XXIII ו ב I have adopted the variation given by Dr. Baer למדני קומי כחי קומי קי which is to be cancelled, since even the St. Petersburg Codex has simply in the text without any *Kethiv* and *Keri*. It must, therefore, be regarded as a simple variant.

In Isa. XLVII 10 the St. Petersburg Codex had originally אמרח in the text as it is in our MSS. and editions. The Reviser, however, placed a Yod over it and remarked in the margin against it אמרה Yod is to be cancelled. But this variant is not peculiar to the Eastern School as is evident from Orient. 1478 which has אמרח in the text with the following Massorah against it: In the Mugah it is אמרח and the Massorah on it is the Yod is redundant.¹ Hence the statement of Dr. Baer in the Preface to the Five Megilloth, p. VI, which I have adopted in my notes² must be cancelled.

Isa. LIV 9 is given by Dr. Baer in his Preface to Jeremiah, p. XI, as exhibiting one of the differences between the Westerns and the Easterns. He says that the Westerns read בּיבֵי two words and the Easterns בֹיבֵי one word.³ But this is an ordinary variant as is attested by the MSS. Hence Orient. 1478 remarks against it: It is the subject of a various reading, some write it one word and some two words.⁴ To the same effect is Kimchi whom Dr. Baer wrongly quotes to support the variation as existing between the two Schools and the printed Massorah Parva.⁵ The

במונה אמרתי ומסי׳ עליה יתי׳ יו״ד.

למער׳ אַמַרְתָּ, למדנ׳ אמרתי כתיב אָמַרְתָּ קרי. בי

משער׳ בִּי־מֵי תרין מלין, למדנ׳ בִּימֵי מלה הרא.

פליני׳ אית דכת׳ מלה חדא ואית דכת׳ תרי׳ מלין.מתחלפין כימי מלה חדא.

St. Petersburg Codex, the Chaldee, the Syriac and the Vulgate have it in one word, whilst the Septuagint and most of the MSS. and all the early editions have it in two words. Being an ordinary variant I have not described it as constituting a difference between the Westerns and Easterns.

In the Preface to the Five Megilloth, p. VI, Dr. Baer gives קורים plene Isa. LVIII ו as one of the differences between these two Schools because it is plene in the St. Petersburg Codex, which I have adopted. The Codex had originally שלי שלי defective and the Reviser placed the Vav over it with the remark in the margin against it and is by no means peculiar to the Easterns as is evident from the MSS. some of which have it so in the text. It is plene in the editio princeps of the Prophets, Soncino 1485—86; in the first edition of the entire Bible, Soncino 1488; in the third edition of the Bible, Brescia 1494; and in the Pesaro edition of the Prophets 1511. The part of my note, viz. אול בורים בורים is, therefore, to be cancelled.

Dr. Baer states in his List that Isa. LXIII 6 exhibits a difference between the Westerns and Easterns, that the former read with with Kaph and the latter with with Beth. Though this is supported by Geiger it is not given in any of the Lists. Orient. 1478 has the following remark against it in the Massorah Parva: It is written with Kaph and it is derived from Shakar and those who read it with Beth are mistaken. It is simply a variant which is exhibited in some MSS. and is to be found in the editio princeps of the Bible, Soncino 1488 and in the Chaldee. The St. Petersburg Codex had it originally in the text and

¹ Comp. Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel, p. 414. 2 כן בכ"ף והוא מלשו' שכרות ומאן דקרי בבי"ת מעי.

the Reviser altered it into ואשקרם with Kaph. I have, therefore, given it as an ordinary variant.

The following two passages are wrongly given in Dr. Baer's List. Isa. XLV 7 ought to be XLV 18 and LVI 6 ought to be LVI 3 as is attested by all the official Lists.

Jeremiah. — To the instances of variants which obtained in the Western and Eastern recensions and which have been transmitted to us in the official Lists in Jeremiah I have been able to add nine new ones, viz. (1) Jerem. II 20 from the Massorah Parva in Add. 15251; (2) VIII 7 from the official List in the St. Petersburg Codex dated A. D. 1009; (3) XII 14 from the Massorah Parva in Add. 15251; (4) XIII 14 from the List in the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 1009; (5) XXXIV 2 from the Massorah Parva in Orient. 1474; (6) XXXV 3 from the Massorah Parva in Add. 15251; (7) XXXV 17 from the List in the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 1009; (8) XXXVIII 16 and (9) XLVIII 1 both from the Massorah Parva in Add. 15251.

As to the relation of the St. Petersburg Codex dated A. D. 916 which, as we have already pointed out, is supposed to exhibit the Eastern recension, I have to add the following facts to those adduced in the discussion on the condition of the text of Isaiah. In twenty-seven passages this Codex agrees with the Western readings and is against the Eastern recension, whilst in the same number of instances it coincides with the Eastern and is against the Western recension.

¹ Comp. Jerem. II 20; IV 30 originally; VI 6, 6; VII 28; VIII 7; X 13 originally; XIII 14, 18; XXV 2; XXVII 5, 12; XXVIII 3, 17; XXXII 12 originally; XXXIV 2, 3; XXXVIII 16; XLII 6; XLIV 18; XLVIII 3, 44 originally; XLIX 12; L 9, 11, 29; LII 2.

² Comp. Jerem. V 8; IX 23; X 18; XIII 20, 20 second hand; XVII 4; XXVI 8; XXVII 1, 19; XXIX 22 second hand; XXXII 19 second hand; XXXII 34; XXXIV 2; XXXV 17; XXXVI 23; XXXIX 3, 3, 11; XLVI 2; XLVIII 1, 18, 36; XLIX 19, 20; L 6, 20; LII 2.

Out of the large number of variants which occur in this Codex Dr. Baer has selected nineteen and incorporated them in his List as exhibiting differences between the Westerns and Easterns. But the selection is simply arbitrary unless we take it that all the variants in this MS. are Eastern. As in the case of Isaiah (XXX 32) so here the Massorite describes the text as Western. In Jerem. XLVIII 31 the text has the Western reading in the shall mourn, third person singular masculine on which the Massorah Parva remarks: this is the reading of the Westerns, the Babylonians = the Eastern read is it is the mourn, first person singular masculine, thus giving the Maarbai as the substantive reading and relegating the Eastern variant into the margin as an alternative.

We have still to note the following variants in the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 916 which add further proof that it does not exhibit the Eastern recension.

In Jerem. XI II the Kethiv in this MS. is אָלָּ and the Keri אָלָּא, whereas all the official Lists with one exception as well as the editio princeps state the very reverse, that אָנ is the Kethiv according to the Easterns and אָל is the Keri. The MS. No. I in the University Library Madrid gives the Eastern Keri as אָל so that the variation consists in the absence of the Vav conjunctive.

In Jerem. XXVI 24 the St. Petersburg Codex has son of, in the text which is in accordance with the Western recension, but the Massorite put against it the textual reading (בתיב), is בָּנִי sons of, the plural and the Keri is יוֹם son of, the singular.³

¹ Comp. Jerem, IV 20; V 6; VIII 4; IX 21; XIII 25; XV 14, 21; XVIII 17, 21; XIX 3; XXII 14, 16; XXIV 1; XXXVI 23; XXXVII 19; LI 29, 59.

² יה ק' למע', לבבל אה' ק'. 3 בַּוֹר בני כת' בן ק'.

In Jerem. XXIX 7 this Codex has הגליתי in the text which is the Western reading, but the Massorite has against it the Kethiv הגילת and the Keri הגליתי.¹ It will thus be seen that the textual reading put down by the Massorite is neither in accordance with the Westerns nor with the Easterns.

In Jerem. XXXII וו the textual reading in this MS. is וְאָת־הַמְּצְוְהְ which is in accordance with the Western recension. But the Massorite put against it two distinct notes. The first is את לא קי the particle את is to be cancelled and the second is יְהַמְצְוָה קי the Keri is וְהַמְצְוָה.

In Jerem. XXXIII 3 this MS. has הַבְּצְרוֹּ in the text which is the Western reading, but the Massorite put against it 'הַבְּצִי ק' = the Keri is הִנְצְרוֹת, and though this variant makes no difference in the sense, since the one makes it conformable to the phrase in Deut. I 28 and the other to Isa. XLVIII 6, still all the official Lists state that in the Eastern recension is the textual reading and that הַנְצְרוֹת is the Keri. This is the very reverse of what is given as the Kethiv and the Keri in the St. Petersburg Codex.

In Jerem. XLVIII 41 the official List in the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 1009, in the Merzbacher MS., in Bodley No. 11 and in the editio princeps, emphatically states that נחפשו the third person plural, is the textual reading and that the Keri is ותפשו third person singular according to the Easterns, yet the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 916 has the very reverse, since ותפשו is in the text with the remark יוום בותפשו בותפשו ווים the Keri is the plural.

In Jerem. XV אַ הַּיְקְּד the Kal future, is given as the Kethiv and הּיִקְּד the Hiphal future as the Keri according to the Eastern recension in the following official Lists: in the

St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 1009; in the MS. No. 1 in the Madrid Royal Library; the Merzbacher MS.; and in Bodley No. 11. The MS. No. 1 in the University Library Madrid, however, gives the same variant on XVII 14. I have, therefore, given it on both passages.

The following three variations given in Dr. Baer's List are the very reverse of the official Lists. On Jerem. V 17 Dr. Baer says that the Westerns have המשם defective and the Easterns read it חלום plence, whereas all the Lists as well as the editio princeps state the very reverse. The same is the case in Jerem. X 18 which Dr. Baer tells us the Westerns read והצרותי defective and the Easterns והצרותי plene. This I have inadvertently followed. All the official Lists, however, state the very reverse, that the Westerns have it plene and the Easterns read it defective. So also in Jerem. XXXV 11 where Dr. Baer says that the Westerns read אל־הארץ and the Easterns על־הארץ which I have also inadvertently followed. The Rubric in the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 1009 which is the only official List wherein this variation is tabulated, distinctly declares that the Westerns read על־ and the Easterns אל-. In Jerem. L 9 where both Dr. Baer and I give the difference between the Westerns and the Easterns to be that the former read and the latter אל־בבל, the only two official Lists which register this variation state the very reverse. Thus the List in the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 1009 and in Bodley No. 11 say that the Westerns read and the Easterns של-.

Ezekiel. — In Ezekiel I have found in the Massorah Parva of the different MSS. nine variations between the Westerns and Easterns which do not appear in the official Lists. (1) Ezek. VI 14 is from the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 916; (2) VIII 3 is from Add. 21161 in the British Museum; (3) so is the second variant recorded on this

CHAP. IX.

verse; (4) X 21 is from Add. 15251; (5) XIII 16 is from the St. Petersburg Codex dated 1009; (6) XXIII 17 and (7) XXIII 18 are from Orient. 2201 in the British Museum; (8) XXV 8 is from Add. 15251; and (9) XXXVI 23 is from Orient. 2201.

From a comparison of the text in the St. Petersburg Codex of A D. 916 with our Western recension it will be seen that almost identically the same results are yielded in Ezekiel as we have obtained from the analysis of Isaiah and Jeremiah. Thus of the twenty-seven undoubted differences between the Westerns and the Easterns this Codex agrees in fifteen passages with the *Maarbai*, i. e. our recension or the Western School, whilst in twelve instances it exhibits the *Madinchai* or Eastern recension.

We have still to discuss five passages in the official Lists of the differences between the Westerns and the Easterns which show the character of the text in the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 916.

Ezek. V 11. — All the official Lists state the Westerns read here אָרְרֵע I will diminish, with Resh and that the Easterns have אָרָרַע I will cut off, with Daleth in the text for which the Keri substitutes אָרָרַע with Resh.³ Now the text in this Codex had originally אַרָרע with Daleth which is also the reading in Harley 5710—11; in the second edition

 ¹ Comp. Ezek. I 13 first hand; VII 7, 10, 22; VIII 3; X 21; XIV 19;
 XVI 13; XXIII 17, 18; XXV 8; XXXVI 23; XXXVII 24; XLIII 26;
 XLIV 3.

² Comp. Ezek. XI 6 second hand; XIII 16; XIV 22; XVII 7; XXI 19; XXV 9; XXVII 31; XXIX 4; XXXI 12; XXXII 4; XLII 8 second hand; XLIII 20.

^{3 &#}x27;למני אורע כהי אורע כהי אורע קי, so the Lists in the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 1009; in Codex No. I in the Madrid University Library; in the MS. of Royal Library Madrid; in the Merzbacher MS.; in Bodley No. 11; in Arund. Orient. 16; and in the editio princeps.

of the entire Hebrew Bible, Naples 1491—93; and in the third edition Brescia 1494. The Annotator, however, put against it the following Massorah: "the Kethiv is with Resh and the Keri with Daleth", and though this variant is against all the Lists, Dr. Baer exhibits it in this form as one of the differences between the Westerns and the Easterns. It will thus be seen that according to the testimony of the Massorite, the textual reading or the Kethiv in this Codex exhibits the Western recension.

Ezek. XIII 17. - This Codex tells us that the Easterns read של in the text and that the Keri is אל, whereas according to the Westerns the reverse is the case, the textual reading is אַל־ and the Keri is "עַלַב". The oldest official List, however, of A. D. 1009 states that the textual reading according to the Easterns is של- without any Keri and that the Westerns read "> also without any Keri.3 And though this difference between the two Schools of textual critics is reversed in the other Lists, inasmuch as they state that the Easterns read אל־ and the Westerns לעל־ still they all agree that there is no Kethiv and Keri on this particle here. The Massoretic note, therefore, in the Codex in question is at variance with all the official Lists and can only be regarded as exhibiting the Massorah of one of the several Schools of Massorites which obtained in the East.

Ezek. XXII 4. — This Codex which has ישָר in the text, remarks in the Massorah Parva that the Easterns read מָד, All the official

י אגדע. רע כת, רע ק׳.

² עַל־בנות אֶל ק׳ לבבי, אֶל־ כת׳ למע׳ וק׳ עַל־.

³ למע׳ אֶל־בנות, למדנ׳ עַל־בנות.

י מעי על־בנות, למעי למעי אל־בנות, so the Merzbacher MS.; Bodley No. 11; Arund. Orient. 16; and the editio princeps.

י עד־שנותיך בבב׳ עת ק׳. ולמע׳ עד־ ק׳.

Lists, however, positively state that the textual reading of the Easterns, i. e. the מָת is מָת and that the *Keri* is "עָר."

Ezek. XXIII 19. — On this passage this Codex which has ותרבה in the text, states in the Massorah Parva that the Easterns read וַתְּרֶבּ and that the Westerns read מַתְרָבָּה and that the Westerns read אות בוּלָבְּבּ All the official Lists, however, most emphatically state that the Eastern textual reading (כתיב) is וַתְּרָבּה and that the Keri is וְתַּרְבָּה.

Ezek. XLIV 3. — The List in the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 1009 states that the Westerns read here לְאֵכֶל defective which is the textual reading in the editio princeps of the Bible, Soncino 1488, and that the Easterns read it plene. As this is the only official List which has preserved this record we must accept it as final. The text, therefore, in the Codex in question, i. e. the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 916 which reads לאכל exhibits in this instance also the Western recension.

Dr. Baer has included in his List of the differences between the Westerns and Easterns no fewer than forty-eight variations 4 simply because they occur in the St. Petersburg Codex dated A. D. 916. But it is sufficiently evident from the above analysis that this MS. does not exhibit

י ער קר' ער קר' ער מער' ער־שנותיך, למער' ער קר' ער קר', so the List in the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 1009; the Merzbacher MS.; the Madrid MS. in the Royal Library; Bodley No. 11; Arund. Orient. 16; and the editio princeps.

יותרבה לבב' ותרב ק', ולמע' ותרבה ק'י

^{3 &#}x27;למע' ותרכה, למרנ' ותרכה למי, so the List in the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 1009; the Merzbacher MS.; the MS. No. I in the Royal Library Madrid; Bodley No. II; Arund. Orient. 16; and the editio princeps.

⁴ Comp. Ezek. V 12, 13; IX 8; XI 7, 19; XII 14; XIII 2; XIV 17; XVI 4, 29, 46, 48; XVII 7, 14, 15; XVIII 2, 20; XXI 2, 9, 14, 19; XXII 12, 12, 13; XXIII 35, 46; XXVI 17; XXVIII 26; XXX 18; XXXI 4; XXXII 16, 26; XXXIII 33; XXXIV 23; XXXVI 5; XXXIX 28; XL 2, 3, 25; XLIV 3; XLVI 6, 6, 8, 9, 21; XLVII 6, 11; XLVIII 28.

the Eastern recension. Hence no various reading which occurs in it can legitemately be characterised as Eastern.

The Minor Prophets. — In the Minor Prophets I have only been able to add one instance to the differences between the Westerns and Easterns, viz. עֹלְלֵיהֶם their children, Hos. XIV which according to the Western School is defective, whilst according to the Eastern recension it is עוֹלְלִיהָם plene.¹

As to the relation of the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 916 to the two recensions, it is to be remarked that of the twenty-three passages in which a comparison can definitely be instituted no fewer than thirteen agree with our text or the *Maarbai*;² whilst it is only in ten instances that this Codex coincides with the Eastern recension or *Madinchai*.³

In two passages this Codex differs both from the Eastern and Western recensions. Thus on Nah. II 6 all the official Lists state that the textual reading (בּתֹליכִתם) according to the Westerns is שַּהַלִּיכָתִם with Vav and that the Keri is with Yod, but that the Easterns have בַּהְלִיכָתִם with Yod both in the Kethiv and Keri, whereas this Codex reads with neither Vav nor Yod. Again on Habak. III וּ בַּהְנִינוֹתְי with official Lists declare that the Westerns read בַּנְנִינוֹתְי without any Keri and that the Easterns read בַּנְנִינוֹתְי without any Keri and that the Keri is בָּנְנִינוֹתְי with codex has in the text (בֹתִינֹתִי with both Vavs defective to which

¹ This Massorah is the Margin on Psalm XVII 14 in Harley 5710-11 Vide supra p. 214.

² Comp. Hos. IV 12; XIV 1, 5 first hand; Amos III 6; VI 8; Micah VI 5 first hand; VII 5, 5; Nahum II 12 first hand; Zeph. III 7; Zech. XII 10; XIV 4; Malachi I 14.

³ Comp. Hos. VIII 13; IX 6; Joel 1 12; IV 7; Micah V 12; Nah. III 8; Hab. II 16; Zech. IX 17; XIII 7; XIV 13.

the later Massorite added a note in the margin to make it conformable to the Eastern Kethiv.¹

That the text in this Codex does not exhibit the Eastern recension, but that a later Annotator tried in several instances to make it conformable to the readings of the *Madinchai* is, moreover, evident from the following passages.

On Hosea IV 12, the official List in the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 1009 states that the Westerns read here וְּמַקְלוֹ and his staff, and that the Easterns read it and from his voice. Thus Codex of A. D. 916 like our text reads וְמַקְלוֹ , yet the Annotator remarks in the Massorah Parva that the textual reading is וְמַקְלוֹ (which is contrary to the text) and there is a difference of opinion about it.²

Hosea IV 5. — Here the official Lists state that the Westerns read מַמְנֵי from them, but that the Easterns have from me in the text (בְּחִיבוֹ), and that the Keri according to some Lists is מַמְנוֹ On a close examination of the MS., however, it will be seen that this Codex had originally in the text, which is the Western reading, and that the Annotator altered it into מַמֵנוֹ and remarked against it in the margin Read מַמֵנוֹ which makes it conformable to the Eastern recension. It is, however, to be stated that the official List in the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 1009 simply remarks that the Easterns read מַמֵנוֹ from me, without any alternative or Keri and that this is also given in Bodley No 11 and in the editio princeps.

On Micah VI 5 the Lists state that the Westerns read אם what, and that the Easterns have של who in the

¹ On the textual reading בניונותי the Annotator remarks שונותר which contradicts the text.

² וַמַלְּלוּ ומקלוּ כת׳ ופּול׳.

³ ממנו 1 ממני 2 נו ק׳.

text (כתיב), but that the Keri is שלה what. The text, however, in this Codex is מה as it is in the Western recension, but the Annotator put against it in the margin the Kethiv is מה and the Keri is מה, thus contradicting the text in order to make it conformable to the Eastern reading.

Nahum II 12. — According to the offical Lists the Western reading here is ומרעה הוא, whilst the Easterns have הוא in the text (כתיב) for which the Keri is הוא. Here too this Codex has הוא the Western reading in the text, but here again the Annotator put against it the contradictory note the textual reading is with Yod (הוא), but the Keri is with Vav (הוא). 2

Zechariah XIV 4 affords the most conclusive proof that this Codex exhibits the Western recension and not the text of the Madinchai. The official Lists distinctly state that according to the Western recension this verse reads וְעַמְדוּ רַגְלֵיו בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא עַל־הַר and his feet shall stand in that day upon the mount &c. and that the Eastern text has it וְעַמָרוּ רַגְלַיו עַל־הַר and his feet shall stand upon the mount &c. leaving out the words ביום ההוא in that day. This Codex, however, does not leave out the words in question according to the Easterns, but reads the verse exactly as the Western recension has it. The Annotator who states the difference between the two Schools of textual critics in this verse tells us that he found ביום ההוא which the text exhibits, to be the Western reading and that the Babylonians do not recognise this phrase as either Kethiv or Keri.3 He, therefore, distinctly describes the text in the Codex before us as exhibiting the Western recension.

י מה־יעץ מי כת׳ מה ק׳.

י ומרעה הוא י' כ' ו' ק'. ²

ים ההוא∘על הר, קר' מער׳, כד אשכחן בגניז: בבלא' לא כת' ולא קר׳. כיום יהוא∘על

Dr. Baer has greatly obscured the issue of the investigation as to which of the two Schools of textual critics this remarkable Codex belongs by unjustifiably incorporating in his Lists of the differences between the Westerns and Easterns many of the variants in this MS. and by exhibiting them as Eastern readings. He has thus increased his List for the Minor Prophets alone by no fewer then twenty-nine passages, is simply because they occur in this MS., whereas many of them are also to be found in our acknowledged Western Codices and in the early editions.

The Hagiographa. — For this division of the Hebrew Bible I have collated the following official Lists: (1) The List in the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 1009; (2) in the Merzbacher MS.; (3) Bodley No. 11; (4) Bodley No. 93; (5) Orient. 4227 British Museum and (6) in the editio princeps. Neither the Madrid Codex No. 1 nor the splendid MS. Arund. Orient. 16 in the British Museum gives the differences between the Westerns and Easterns for the Hagiographa.

Psalms. — To the Psalms I have been able to add eight new instances which are not given in the official Lists. They are all from the Massorah Parva in MS. No. 1—3 in the Paris National Library and are as follows:
(1) Ps. XXII 5, 6; (2) LII 1, 2; (3) LIII 1, 2; (4) LIV 2; (5) LXXIX 10; (6) XC 1; (7) CI 5 and (8) CXXIX 5, 6. Dr. Baer's statement that the difference between the

¹ Comp. Hosea IX 9, 16; X 11; XIII 9; Joel. I 12; II 7, 22; Amos
III 11; V 2, 20; IX 7; Micah IV 3; V 1; VII 16; Nah. II 5; III 11; Hab.
II 5; Zeph. II 7; III 9, 11, 18; Zech. I 4; II 12; IV 10; XI 10; XIV 18;
Mal. III 11, 14, 22.

² Comp. the notes in my edition on Hos. IX 9, 16; Joel I 12; II 7; Amos III 11; Micah IV 3; VII 16; Zeph. III 9, 18; Zech. I 4; XI 10; XIV 18 &c.

Westerns and the Easterns on Ps. CI I consists in the former reading אומר plene and the latter מומר defective is contrary to all the official Lists and to the Massorah. The List in the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 1009 emphatically states that according to the Westerns it is nentirely defective, whilst according to the Easterns it is plene. This is also the case in all the other Lists both in the MSS. and in the editio princeps. And Add. 15251 has in the Massorah Parva against it that it is the only instance in which מומר is defective according to the Westerns. Westerns.

232

Proverbs. - In Proverbs I have added one instance, viz. XXX 6 from the Massorah Parva in MS. No. 1-3 in the National Library Paris. According to the Merzbacher MS. and Bodley No. 11 the difference between the Westerns and Easterns in Prov. XII 18 is that the former read it בוטה with He at the end, and the latter with Aleph, and this difference I give in the Notes on the text of my edition. The List in the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 1009, however, distinctly states that the Easterns have as Kethiv בימה with Yod and as Keri בומה with Vav. Hence an Aleph or He at the end is not at all the point at issue, and this is supported by the List in Orient, 4227 in the British Museum and in the List of the editio princeps. The List in the St. Petersburg Codex also differs from the other Lists in its statement as to the nature of the variation between the two Schools with regard to Prov. XVIII 20, inasmuch as it declares that both the Kethiv and the Keri are הביאת with Yod, according to the Easterns.4

למע' לרוד מזמור מלא, למדנ' לרוד מזמר חסר.למע' מזמר חס' דחסר, למדנ' מזמור מלא.

³ מזמר ל' חם' למער'.

⁴ למדני תביאת כתי וקי.

Job. — In Job I have added one new instance, viz. XXXVI 18 from the Massorah Parva in MS. No. 1-3 in the National Library, Paris. It is also to be remarked that the official Lists do not agree among themselves as to the exact nature of the differences between these two Schools with regard to some of the words. Thus for instance in Job II 7 the List in the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 1009, the Merzbacher MS. and Bodley No. 11 state that the Easterns have וַעָּד and unto, with Vav conjunctive both as the Kethiv and Keri, 1 and this in the form in which I have given the variant in the Notes. According to the Lists, however, in Bodley No. 93, in Orient. 4227 British Museum and in the editio princeps the textual reading (כתיב) is יעד and unto, and the Keri is unto, without the Vav conjunctive which is the very reverse of the Western recension.2

In Job XXVI 12 all the Lists agree that the Westerns have ובחבונתו both as Kethiv and Keri, but they differ greatly with regard to the Eastern variant. Thus the List in the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 1009 states that the Eastern Kethiv is וכתבנותו. Bodley No II says it is ובחובנתו; Bodley No. 93 and the editio princeps give it יבחבונחו, thus making it exactly like the Kethiv and Keri according to the Westerns and doing away with the variant altogether. The Merzbacher MS. and Orient. 4227, however, emphatically state that according to the Easterns the Kethiv is ובתיבנתו and the Keri is ובתבונתו.3 This variant probably exhibits the recension of one School of Massorites, whilst the one which I give in the Notes on this passage proceeds from another School who included the word in

ו למדנ' ושר כתיב וקרי.

² According to these Lists the difference is as follows: למער׳ עד כתיב ועד קרי, למדני ועד כתיב עד קרי.

פלמע׳ ובתבונתו למדנ׳ ובתיבנתו כתיב ובתבונתו קרי.

question in the List of words wherein the letters are transposed. 1

The Eastern variant which I have given on Job XXXIX 15 is from Add. 465 in the Cambridge University Library. The Massorah Parva in this MS. emphatically declares that these extraordinary points are on both letters Cheth and Yod; whereas Dr. Baer marks the Yod alone. As this passage is not included in the Massoretic List of words which have extraordinary points, it affords another proof of the oft-stated fact that the different Schools of Massorites had different Rubrics, and that the instances which they exhibit are not exhaustive, but are simply to be taken as typical.

The Five Megilloth. — In the Megilloth I have added two new instances, viz. Ruth II 7 from Harley 5710—11 and Esther II 3 from Add. 465 in the University Library Cambridge. I have still to examine the following passages which Dr. Baer has incorporated in his List and which I have inadvertently adopted as exhibiting the Eastern readings.

In the note on Canticles II 17 which I give as an Eastern variant, the word למדנחאי according to the Easterns, is to be corrected into מ"ם other MSS., another reading is. Though the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 1009 on Ezek. XIII 2 gives it as one of the seven instances where the Kethiv is מולים unto, and the Keri על־ upon, this by itself, as my analysis of this Codex has shown, does not constitute it a variant of the Madinchai unless it is expressly described as such in another MS.

יבתובותו קרי ובחבונתו כחיב, נכmp. The Massorah, letter ב, § 480; Vol. II, pp. 53, 54. למרנחאי וְחַיַּת נקור על חית ויור. 2

³ Comp. The Massorah, letter 3, § 521, Vol. II, p. 296.

⁴ Comp. The Massorah, letter X, § 514, Vol. I, p. 57.

In my note on Ruth III 15 I followed Dr. Baer in describing הבי as Milel according to the Madinchai. Dr. Baer who says that the Westerns read it as the Hiphil from Lin to come, whilst the Easterns read it as the imperative Kal from יהב to give, refers to the printed Massorah Parva on this passage and to the Massorah Magna on Jerem. XXXIX 9 in corroboration of this statement. But the Massorah Parva simply remarks that the verb to come, is in nine passages defective of the radical Aleph and that about this instance which is one of the nine, there is a difference of opinion. To the same effect is the Massorah Magna on Jerem. XXXIX 9, which after enumerating the nine passages and giving Ruth III 15 as the last instance, remarks there is a difference of opinion about this last one,2 i. e. whether it is defective or not. We have, however, seen that the expression פלונתא = there is a difference of opinion, does not by itself denote Eastern unless it is so specified.

Lamentations I 21. — For the same reason למדנחאי according to the Easterns, on Lament. I 21 where I have followed Dr. Baer, is to be corrected into $mathbb{m} = a$ other MSS. have, or another reading is, since it rests upon the same expression מלוני $mathbb{m} = a$ difference of opinion.

Eccl. VIII 2. I have inadvertently followed Dr. Baer and given שמו לשני defective, as the Western reading and שמור plene, as the Eastern. According to the List in the St. Petersburg Codex the Western recension reads שמור plene, and the Easterns have it שמור defective. This is corroborated by Harley 5710–11 which not only has שמור in the text, but remarks against it in the Massorah Parva plene according to the Westerns.³

ים חם' בליש' ביאה ופלונתא על דין.

² בתרא פלוגתא.

³ שמור מל' למע'.

Eccl. XII 13. — Here too I have inadvertently followed Dr. Baer giving אַמוֹר plene, as the Western reading and שׁמוֹר defective, as the Eastern, whereas according to the St. Petersburg Codex which is the only MS. that gives it in the official List the reverse is the case, the Westerns have it defective and the Easterns plene.

In the following instances the official Lists differ among themselves as to the exact nature of the variants which obtained between the Westerns and the Easterns with regard to the words in question.

On Ruth I 6 the List in the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 1009 states that according to the Easterns both the *Kethiv* and the *Keri* are מוֹלָּבוֹיִם.

Ruth II 11. — According to Bodley No. 11; Bodley No. 93 and the Merzbacher MS. the Easterns read here אָת־כל, whilst the Westerns have simply בכל.

Ruth III 5. — Here too the same difference obtained between these two Schools of textual critics according to the Lists in the Merzbacher MS.; in Bodley No. 93; and in Orient. 4227 in the British Museum.

Eccl. III 13. — According to the List in the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 1009 the Westerns read הְּעֹשֶׁה plene, and the Easterns have it הְּעִשֶּׁה defective, whereas according to the Lists in the other MSS. and in the editio princeps the reverse is the case, the Westerns have it defective and the Easterns plene.

Eccl. IV 1. — According to the same List in the St. Petersburg Codex הַעָּשׁוּקִים which occurs twice in this

י למדני ותקום כתי וקרי.

י למע׳ כל־אשר, למדנ׳ את־כל אשר קרי. 2

³ למע' העושה מל', למדנ' העשה.

⁴ למע' העשה חםר, למרנ' העושה מלי, so the Merzbacher MS; Bodley No. 11; Bodley No. 93; and Orient. 4227 British Museum.

verse is plene in both instances in the Eastern recension, whereas all the other official Lists state that it is defective in both instances according to the Easterns. Moreover, all the Lists state that according to the Westerns the second הַּעִשִּׁהְים alone is plene, whereas the first is הַעִשִּׁהְים alone is plene, whereas the first is defective. But the Massorah Parva in the editio princeps emphatically states that it is plene in both instances according to the Westerns and in the text follows the Eastern recension, having it defective in both clauses.

Daniel. — In Daniel I have added no fewer than seven new variations between the Westerns and the Easterns. Six of the instances (Dan. IV 16; VI 5, 19, 27; VII 4; XI 44) are from MS. No. 1—3 in the Paris National Library, and one variant (XI 6) is from the Lists in the Merzbacher MS.; in Bodley No. 93; and in Orient. 4227. One new instance which occurs in the List of the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 1009 I have omitted. In Dan. XI 44 the Easterns according to this MS. read That defective.

In one instance the Lists do not agree as to the exact nature of the difference between these two Schools of textual critics. According to the List in the St. Petersburg Codex, the Westerns read וְּפִשְׁרֵא in Dan. V 8, whilst the Easterns read וּפִשְׁרֵא But according to three other Lists the Westerns have in the text וְּפִשְׁרֵא with Aleph, for which the Keri substitutes וְּפִשְׁרֵא with He, whilst the Easterns have וּפִשְׁרֵא with He, whilst the Easterns have וּפִשְׁרֵא with He both as Kethiv and Keri. Another

ו למדני העשוקים בי מלי.

² חברים חרויהון העשקים למת' so the Merzbacher MS.; Bodley No. 11; Bodley No. 93; Orient. 4227; and the *cditio princeps*.

³ למע׳ העשוקים תנינא מלא.

י *רבוע העשוקם הוג נא בורא.* 4 העשקים למערבאי תרויהון מל', למדינחאי תרויהין חם'.

ה למעי ושמעות, למדני ושמעת כתי. 5 למעי

⁶ למעי ופשרה, למדני ופשרא כתי וקי.

י וק' וק' ופשרה כת' ופשרה ק', למרנ' ופשרה כת' וק', so the Merzbacher MS.; Bodley No. 11; and Bodley No. 93.

List, however, which agrees with these MSS. as for as the Western reading is concerned, states that the Easterns have אַנְשׁרָא with Aleph both in the Kethiv and Keri¹ and in this respect, therefore, agrees with the List in the St. Petersburg Codex.

Ezra-Nehemiah. — In Ezra X 3 the note should be "the Easterns have בַּעְצֵה in the counsel of as the textual reading (בתיב), and in the Keri בַּעָצַה according to the counsel of," instead of simply "the Easterns read בַּעָצַה according to the counsel".2

In Nehemiah XIII 15 I have followed Dr. Baer and given a variation between the Westerns and Easterns on and they were lading. But as this simply rests on the expression ופלונהא and there is a difference of opinion about it,3 and as we have already shown that this word by itself does not denote Madinchai, my note is to be corrected into יילְמְשִׁים other MSS. have or another reading is יִּעְמְשִׁים with Sin as in Neh. IV 11.

Chronicles. — In Chronicles I have been able to increase the number of variations between the Westerns and Easterns by the following eleven instances: I Chron. IV 15, 20; VI 41; VII 38; XV 24; 2 Chron. II 17; V 12, 13; VII 6; XIII 14; and XVII 8. The following three instances I have adopted from Dr. Baer's List: I Chron. V 27; VII 18; and 2 Chron. XXIV 19. These, however, I could not verify. In four passages the official Lists differ among themselves as to the exact nature of the variations

¹ למע' ופשרא כת' ופשרה קרי, למדנ' ופשרא כת' וקרי, so the List in Orient. 4227 British Museum. Unless we assume that after למע' ופשרא כתיב have dropped out of the first line the editio princeps differs from all the other Lists.

² למרנ' בעצח כח' כעצח, so all the Lists instead of למרנ' בעצח,

³ The MS. Massorah which Dr. Baer adduces in support of the Eastern reading is simply לית ובתיב סמ"ך ופלונתא.

which obtained between these two Schools of textual critics.

1 Chron. VII 28. — According to the List in Arund. Orient. 16; in Bodley No. 93; and in the editio princeps, the Westerns read ער־עירה unto Aiyah, in two words and the Easterns ערשיה Adayah in one word. The latter though the Easterns recension, is exhibited in the fourth edition of the entire Bible, Pesaro 1511 - 17; in the first edition of the Rabbinic Bible by Felix Pratensis 1517; and in the Bomberg quarto Bible of 1521. According to the List in the Merzbacher MS, however, in Bodley No. 11 and in Orient. 4227 British Museum, the Westerns read ער־ערָה unto Addah in two words, whilst the Easterns read it עדערה Adaddah or עַרְעָרָה Adadah in one word (comp. Josh. XV 22). Dr. Baer indeed quotes Codex No. 18, Tzufutkale which gives a third variant. According to this MS. the Westerns read עד עיה unto Aiyah, whilst the Easterns have this as the textual reading (כחיב), but substitute for it in the Keri עזה Gaza.1

ו Chron. XVII 6. — According to the List in the Merzbacher MS.; Bodley No. 11; Bodley No. 93; Arund. Orient. 16; and the editio princeps, the Westerns read here my people, and the Easterns have אָשָׁ his people in the text (בתיב), for which they substitute my people in the Keri. But the List in Orient. 4227 emphatically declares that the Westerns have אָשָׁ as Kethiv and Keri, and that the Easterns have his people, as Kethiv and Keri.²

I Chron. XXV 27. — The official Lists greatly differ about the Western and Eastern orthography of the proper name in this verse. They exhibit no fewer than four varieties each of which is claimed as the genuine reading of the respective Schools. (1) According to the List in

¹ למע׳ עד עיה כת׳ וכן קרי, למדנ׳ עיה כת׳ עזה ק׳.2 למע׳ עמי כתי׳ וקרי, למדנ׳ עמו כתי׳ וקרי.

the Merzbacher MS. and the Aleppo Codex quoted by Dr. Baer, the Westerns read it לאליתה to Eliyathah, and the Easterns read it לאליאחה to Eliathah, with an Aleph after the Yod, thus making it conformable to verse four of this chapter. (2) According to the Lists in Bodley No. 11 and Bodley No. 93 the Westerns spell it לאליתה with He at the end, and the Easterns לאליתא with Aleph at the end. (3) According to the Lists in Arund. Orient. 16 and Orient and the Easterns the Westerns write it לָאֵליאָתָה and the Easterns לאליאתא. The two recensions agree in having Aleph after the Yod and differ about the ending, the former having He at the end and the latter Aleph. And (4) the List in the editio princeps which states that the Westerns have לָאֵלִיאָתָה with Aleph after the Yod and He at the end, whilst the Easterns read it לאליָתא without Aleph after the Yod, but with Aleph at the end instead of He.1

2 Chron. XV 2. — The five Lists which I have collated for this division of the Bible as well as the List in the editio princeps distinctly state that the Westerns read here שׁמָשִׁנִי hear ye me, defective and that the Easterns read it plene. In my note on this passage I have inadvertently followed Dr. Baer and given the reverse as exhibiting the respective Schools.

In giving the variations of these two Schools of textual critics on each word which is the subject of the variant, I have not only reverted to the practice of the best MSS., but have enabled the student to see at a glance the nature of the various reading. The official Eastern readings now occupy their rightful position by the side of the official Keri.

י למע׳ לאליתה כת׳ וקרי, למד׳ לאליאתה כתיב וקרי.

² שמעוני מלא , so the Merzbacher MS.; Bodley No. 11; Bodley No. 93; Arund. Orient. 16; Orient. 4227; and the editio princeps.

Chap. X.

The Differences between Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali.

In the early part of the tenth century Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali, two rival textual critics, were engaged in the redaction of two rival recensions of the Hebrew Bible which they respectively furnished with vowel-points, accents and the Massorah. Without entering into the controversy whether Aaron Ben-Asher who flourished circa A.D. 900—940 was a Karaite or a Rabbinic Jew which is outside the scope of this chapter, it is sufficient to state that he had derived great advantages in his Biblical studies from his father Moses Ben-Asher who had already edited a Codex of the Bible circa A. D. 890—95.

The Codex of Moses Ben-Asher or Ben-Asher the elder as we shall henceforth call him, still exists and is in the possession of the Karaite community at Cairo. It now contains only the Former and Latter Prophets or the second of the three divisions of the Hebrew Bible. According to the Epilogue at the end of the Minor Prophets, which is in the hand writing of Ben-Asher the elder and which Jacob Saphir copied, the writer of this MS. describes himself as Moses Ben-Asher and states that he finished it in Tiberias in the year 827 after the destruction of Jerusalem. This is

אני משה בן אשר כתבתי זה המחזור של מקרא על פי ביד אלהי חטוב עלי באר היטב במדינת מעזיה טבריה העיר ההוללה כשהבינו עדת נביאים בחורי ה' קרושי אלהינו המבינים כל נסתרות והמשפירים סוד חכמה אילי הצדק אנשי אמנה לא כיחדו דבר ממה שניתן להם ולא הוסיפו מאמ' על מה שנמסר להם והעצימו והגדילו המ'ק עשרים וארבעה ספרים וייסדום באמונתם במעמי שכל בפירוש דבור בחיך מתוך ביופי עשרים וארבעה ספרים וייסדום באמונתם במעמי שכל בפירוש דבור בחיך מתוך ביופי

according to the Jewish chronology, which according to our reckoning synchronises with A. D. 895. A copy made from this Codex was purchased by Moses Isserles for 100 Ducats in the year 1530 and is now deposited in the Synagogue at Cracow. It is minutely described by M. Weissmann in the Hebrew Weekly called *Magid*.¹

The Codex of Aaron Ben-Asher or Ben-Asher the younger is in the possession of the Jewish community at Aleppo. This MS. which contains the whole Hebrew Bible, like its predecessor is furnished with vowel-points, accents and both Massorahs Parva and Magna. In the Epilogue we are told that it is not the autograph of Ben-Asher, but that the celebrated Scribe R. Salomon b. Bevieh made this copy and that the original was sacredly consigned by R. Israel of Bozrah to the Karaite community at Jerusalem in trust of the two brothers, the Princes Josiah and Hezekiel who flourished circa A.D. 980, under the following conditions: (1) It is to be produced before the Congregation of the Holy City on the three great Festivals, Passover, Pentecost and Tabernacles for publicly reading therefrom the Lessons. (2) In case the said two Princes leave Jerusalem they are to give the MS. into trust to two other trustworthy and pious men. And (3) any Jew of the Rabbinic persuasion may use it for comparing and correcting by it other MSS., but not for the purpose of study.2

מאמר יהי רצון מלפני יוצרנו שיאיר עינינו ויגיה לבנו בתורתו ללמד וללמד ולעשות בלב שלם ובנפש חפצה ולכל ישראל אמן. נכתב לקץ שמונה מאות ועשרים ושבע שנים לחורבן הבית השני שיאמר יוצר נשמות וישוב עליו ברחמים ויבנהו באבני אקרח וספיר וכדכד בנין שלם בנין מקוים שלא ינתש ולא יהרם ולא ינתץ לעולם ולעולמי עולמים במהרה בימינו ובימי כל ישראל אמן: אבן ספיר חלק ראשון דף יד עמור ב.

הנודע בן בויאעא ואו בן ירוחם! הסופר המהיר רוח ה' תניחנו ונקד ומסר אותו באר

 $^{^1}$ The description is given in the Supplement (הצופה) Nos. 47, 48, pp. 186, 190, Lyck 1857, where the Epilogue agrees almost literally with the one contained in the *Eben Saphir*, Vol. I, fol. 14b, Lyck 1886. 2 זה המצחף השלם של עשרים וארבעה ספרים שכתב אותו מרנא ורבנא שלמה 2

According to a note on page 1, the Codex with the permission of the two said Princes was transferred from Jerusalem to the community in Egypt circa A. D. 1000—1004 for the Jerusalemite Synagogue before the capture of the Holy City to save it from destruction.

In the year 1009, that is three or four years after it was conveyed to the Jerusalem Congregation at Cairo and most probably in the life-time of the first Trustees, a certain Samuel b. Jacob copied this Standard Codex of Ben-Asher for Meborach Ibn Osdad. This very important

היטים המלמד הגדול החכם הנבון אדון הסופרים ואבי החכמים וראש המלמדים המהיר במעשיו המביז במפעליו היחיד בדורותיו מר רב אהרן כן מר רב אשר תהי נפשו צרורה בצרור החיים עם הגביאים והצדיקים והחסירים. הקדיש אותו השר הגדול האדיר האביר מרנא ורבנא ישראל תפארת כל ישראל החכם והנבון החסיד השר הנדיב ירים ה' דגלו ויציץ ציץ נזרו ויגביה עווו ממדינת בצרה כן מר רב שמחה כן מר רב סעדיה כן מר רב אפרים רוח ה' תניחם לירושלם עה"ק עם זרע ישראל קהלות יעקב עדת ישורון בעלי המרע סגולת החכמים השוכנים בהר ציון אלקים יכונניה עד עולם סלה קדש לה' לא ימכר ולא ינאל על מנת שלא יצא מתחת ידי שני הנשיאים הגדולים כבוד גדולת הדושת הור הרר הנשיא יאשיהו והנשיא יחזקיהו בני כבוד קרושת הנשיא דור בן הנשיא בזעתה נפשם צרורה בצרור החיים בנ"ע תחת עץ החיים כדי שיוציאוהו אל הישיבות ואל המהילות שבעיר המדש בשלשה רגלים חג המצות וחג השבועות וחג הסכות לקרות בו ולהתבונן וללמד ממנו כל אשר יחפצו ויבחרו ואם יראו שני הנשיאים הגדולים מר רב יאשיהו ויחזקיהו יחיים צורם בדרך ההצלחה שיפקדו אותו עם שני אנשים צדיקים ונבונים וירועים יראי אלהים אנשי אמת שונאי בצע עשו כחכמתם ובחזקתם ואם יחפוץ איש מכל זרע ישראל מבעלי הבנה מהרבנים בכל ימות השנה לראות בו דבר יתר או חסר או סתור או סדור או סתום או פתוח או שעם מהשעמים האלו יוציאוהו אליו לראות ולהשכיל ולהבין לא לקרות ולדרוש ויושיבוהו למקומו ולא יתדבקו בו איש אין בו אמונה וה' אלהי ישראל ישים אותו סימן מוב סימן ברכה עליו ועל זרעו ועל כל ישראל ויתקיים עליו מקרא שכתוב כי אצק מים על צמא ונוולים על יבשה אצוק רוחי על זרעך וברכתי על צאצאיך וצמחו בבין חציר כערבים על יבלי מים זה יאמר לה׳ אני וזה יקרא בשם יעקב וזה יכתוב ידו לה' ובשם ישראל יכנה וכל הברכות האמורות בו יהולו ויבואו ויאחזו ויאגורו עליו ועל זרעו ועל כל הגלוים עליו ועל כל מי ישמע ויאזין ויקשיב ויעשה כדברים האלה ולא יחליפם ולא ימירם לעולם ולעולמי עולמים ברוך ה' לעולם אמן ואמן: אבן ספיר חלק ראשון דף יב וי"ג. י אנתקל בחכם אלאפתכאק מן נהב ירושלם עיר הקורש תבנה ותכונן לקהל

מצרים לכניםת ירושלם תבנה ותכונן בחיי ישראל ברוך שומרו וארור גונבו וארור

copy is now in the Imperial Public Library at St. Petersburg. The name of the Scribe, the place where the copy was made, the honoured person for whom it was transcribed and the date on which it was finished are all most minutely given in the Epigraph of the MS. They are written in the same hand-writing as the MS. itself.

In the long Epigraph which was published by Pinner who was the first to call attention to this Codex when it was in the possession of "the Odessa Society for History and Antiquities" and which is republished in the Catalogue of the Hebrew MSS. in the Imperial Library in St. Petersburg, the year in which it was finished is given according to five different eras. (1) In 4770 of the creation which synchonises with A. D. 1009—10. (2) In the year 1444 after the exile of King Jehoiachin which is uncertain. (3) In the year 1319 according to the Seleucidien era or the era of Contracts (1319 minus 311) = 1008. (4) In the year 940 after the destruction of the second Temple (940 + 68) = 1008 and (5) in the year 399 of the Muhammedan era = A. D. 1009.1

Equally emphatic and distinct is the statement of the Scribe as to the person for whom he made the Codex and the prototype which he followed. "I Samuel b. Jacob," he says on folio 474 a, "have written, vowel-pointed and Massoretically annotated this Codex for the honoured

¹ זה המחזור מקרא שלם נכתב ונגמר בנקודות ובמוסרות ומוגה יפה במדינת מצרים ונשלם בחדש סיון של שנת ארבעת אלפים ושבע מאות ושבעים שנה לבריאת עולם. והיא שנת אלף וארבע מאות וארבעים וארבעה לגלות המלך יהויכין והיא שנת עולם. והיא שנת אלף וארבע מאות וחשע עשרה שנה למלכות יונים שהיא למנין [שטרות] ולפסיקת ואלף ושלוש מאות ותשע עשרה שנה לחרבן בית שני והיא שנת תשע מאות ותשעים לחרבן בית שני והיא שנת תשע מאות וארבעים לחרבן בית שני והיא שנת למלכות קרן זעירה: Comp. Pinner, Prospectus der Odessaer Gesellschaft für Geschichte und Alterthümer, p. 81 &c.; Odessa 1845; Harkavy and Strack, Catalog der Hebräischen Bibelhandschriften der kaiserlichen öffentlichen Bibliothek in St. Petersburg. p. 265 etc., Leipzig 1875.

Rabbi Meborach the Priest b. Joseph surnamed Ibn Osdad, may the Ever-living one bless him." Again in the Epygraph on folio 479 a it is stated: "Samuel b. Jacob copied, vowel-pointed and Massoretically annotated this Codex of the Sacred Scriptures from the correct MSS. which the teacher Aaron b. Moses Ben-Asher redacted (his rest is in Paradise!) and which constitute an exceedingly accurate Exemplar."²

Of Ben-Naphtali nothing is known and no Codex which he redacted has as yet come to light. The passages, therefore, in which he differs from Ben-Asher are only known from the official Lists which have been transmitted to us exhibiting the variations of these two rival scholars. The examples in these Lists may occasionally be supplemented by sundry remarks in the margin of the MSS. and by notices in Massoretico-Grammatical Treatises of mediaeval Grammarians. The latter source, however, cannot always be relied upon, since the Grammarians not unfrequently palm off their super-fine theories on the vowel-points and accents as developments of the respective systems of Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali.

Though the variations between Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali refer to the vowel-points Dagesh, Raphe, the Metheg or Gaya and the accents, yet I have found in one MS. four instances in which these two textual critics differ in the consonants and textual readings.

י אני שמואל בן יעקב כתבתי ונקדתי ומס' זה המצחף לכבוד רבנא מבורך הכהן בן יוסף הידוע בן אזראד יברכהו הי.

בית מן שמאל בן יעקוב כתב ונקד ומסר את המחזור הזה שלמק׳ מן הספרים בית שמאל בן יעקוב כתב ונקד ומסר אהרן בן משה בן אשר נוחו בנן עדן: והוא מונה המונהים המבואר׳, אשר עשה המלמד אהרן בן משה בן אשר נוחו בנן עדן: והוא מונה Comp. Pinner, Prospectus, pp. 85, 86; Harkavy and Strack, Catalog, p. 269.

³ Like the Ben-Ashers there seem to have been several Ben-Naphtalis. Fragments of a Treatise of one of them I give in the Appendix to this Introduction.

Thus on Numb. XXVI 23 the Massorah Parva in Add. 15251 states that Ben-Naphtali reads מְלְבָּוֹה of Puvah, which is the textual reading in this MS., but that Ben-Asher reads מְלְבּנה of Punah.

- (2) On Isa. XXX 23 it states that Ben-Asher reads "the rain of (זרעך) thy seed," which it has in the text, and that Ben-Naphtali reads it "the rain of (ארצך) thy land." ו
- (3) On Jerem. XXVII 19 it states that Ben-Asher has "that remain in this (בעיר) city," which is the textual reading, but that Ben-Naphtali has it "that remain in this (בארץ) land."²

And (4) on Ezek. XIV 16 the Massorah Parva in this MS. states that Ben-Asher reads "but the land (תהיה שממה) shall be desolation," and that Ben-Naphtali reads it "but as for the land (שממה תהיה) desolation shall it be," making it conformable to Ezek. XII 20. I have only noticed the last two variations in the notes of my edition, but I have duly given all the four instances in the Massorah.

Professor Strack has found three other variations between these two redactors which also affect the textual reading of the consonants.

On i Kings III 20 Codex Tzufutkale No. 87 states that Ben-Naphtali like the Westerns reads ישׁינָה she was asleep plene, whilst Ben-Asher like the Easterns reads it ישׁנה defective.

Trite as this difference may appear it affects two important statements which bear upon the redaction of

ים אשר זרעך, בן נפתלי ארצך. בן בן אשר בעיר, בן נפתלי בארץ. ב' בן אשר בעיר, בן נפתלי בארץ.

בן נפת' שממה תהיה. ³

⁴ Comp. The Massorah, letter II, §§ 595, 603—605; Vol. 1, pp. 576, 581, 582.

^{5:} ישנה ה': כן אשר ומרנהא' ישנה ח': Comp. Strack, Zeitschrift für die gesammte lutherische Theologie und Kirche, Vol. XXXVI, p. 611, note 1, Leipzig 1875.

the current text. Maimonides emphatically declares "that the recension of our MSS. is according to the well-known Codex in Egypt, which contains the twenty-four sacred books, and which had formerly been in Jerusalem for many years in order that other Codices might be corrected by it and that both he and all others followed it because Ben-Asher corrected it and minutely elaborated it for many years and revised it many times, as it has been transmitted to us" and Levita who quotes this passage from Maimonides adds "the Westerns in every land follow Ben-Asher, but the Easterns follow the recension of Ben-Naphtali."

The Massoretic note from the Tzufutkale MS., which is fully confirmed by the unanimous testimony of the official Lists, as far as the difference between the Westerns and Easterns on the passage in question is concerned, discloses two important facts with regard to Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali. It shows in the first place that Ben-Asher and the Easterns have here identically the same reading, which is contrary to the usual statement that our Codices follow Ben-Asher who exhibits the Western recension. And in the second place it is apparently against the above cited declaration of Levita that it is the Easterns who follow the text of Ben-Naphtali. The real inference from this Massorah, however, is that it yields an additional proof of the fact to which we have often alluded, that our text does not uniformly exhibit the recension of the Westerns and of Ben-Asher. It not un-

י וספר שסמכנו עליו בדברים אלו הוא ספר הידוע במצרים שהוא כולל כ"ד ספרים שהיה בירושלם מכמה שנים להגיה ממנו הספרים, ועליו היו הכל סומכין, לפי שהגיהו בן אשר, ודקדק בו שנים הרבה, והגיהו פעמים רבות כמו שהעתיקו, ועליו סמכתי בספר תורה שכתבתי כהלכתו, וכן אנחנו סומכין על קריאתו בכל הארצות המכתי בספר חורה שכתבתי האלבה, ואנשי מורח סומכין על קריאת בן נפתלי: Comp. Levita, Massoreth Ha-Massoreth, p. 114, ed. Ginsburg; and see below p. 267.

frequently follows the Easterns and Ben-Naphtali. Hence it is unsafe to describe any MS. as Western and exhibiting the text Ben-Asher or as Eastern and following the recension of Ben-Naphtali, simply because some of its readings happen to coincide with what are believed to be the redaction of one school or the other.

The second passage on which Professor Strack found a Massorah, also referring to the consonants is Jerem. XI 7. Codex Tzufutkale No. 10 states that Ben-Naphtali reads here "and" or "even unto the city" and that Ben-Asher reads it simply "unto the city." Here too the MSS. and the early editions are divided. For though the majority follow Ben-Asher, still some MSS. and some of the best editions follow the reading of Ben-Naphtali as will be seen from my note on this passage. Yet it is perfectly certain that the MSS. and editions which exhibit here Ben-Naphtali's reading do not as a whole follow his recension. The most interesting and instructive part of this Massorah, however, is the fact which it establishes, viz. that the difference between these two redactions consists in the presence or absence of the Vav conjunctive and not in the presence or absence of a Metheg under the Vav as is stated by Dr. Baer.2

Jerem. XXIX 22 is the third instance quoted by Professor Strack where the difference between these two redactors affects the textual reading. Codex Tzufutkale No. 84 states that according to Ben-Naphtali the textual reading here is "and like (יְרָאָדְוֹיִן) Ahab" and that the Keri is "and like (יְרָאָדְוֹיִן) his brethren." Here we have an important

י בין אש': ובספ' מונה ועד לבן נפתלי ערר, ובספ' מונה Comp. Baer and Strack, $Dikduh\bar{e}$ $\it Ha-Teamim,$ p. XIII note.

² Comp. Baer and Delitzsch, Jeremiah, p. 125, Leipzig 1890.
בין בפתלי כצרקיהו וְּכְאֶחְב כתיב וּכְאֶחְיו קרי. בן אשר וּכְאֶחְב כתיב וכן קרי.
Comp. Zeitschrift für die gesammte lutherische Theologie und Kirche, Vol. XXXVI, p. 611, note 1, and S. Pinsker, Einleitung in das Babylonisch-Hebräische Punktationssystem, p. 126, Vienna 1863.

new *Keri* which is entirely different from the one exhibited in the recension of the *Madinchai* as will be seen from my note on this passage.

There is another record of some of the differences between Ben-Asher and the rival redactors which is not given in the official Lists, but which has an important bearing on the discussion of the nature of these variations. On Gen. XLIX 20 Orient. 4445, fol. 40b, has the following Massorah:

	ויש אומרים	מלמד הגדול בן אשר				
Gen. XLIX 20 Deut. XXXIII 28 Judg. XX 33 Isa. XL 18	מֶערַנּי־מֶלֶּרְ יִשְׁרָפּוּ־מֶלִּ מִמֶערַה־זְּכַע תַּעַרְכּוּ־לְוֹ	מַערַנּי מֶלֶּךְ יַעִרפּוּ מָלְ ממערה נָבע תַעַרְכוּ לְוֹ				

The difference, therefore, between Ben-Asher and other redactors of the text is that he has Mercha in all the four instances, whilst the others, probably the followers of Ben-Naphtali, connect these two words with Makeph and have Gaya under the first words. As this MS. is undoubtedly of the early part of the ninth century, and, moreover, as the Massorah in this Codex was added about a century later, there can be no question about the real difference in these passages between Ben-Asher and the other Schools, though we have hitherto had no knowledge of these variations. Indeed from the manner in which the Massorite quotes this distinguished textual critic, viz. "the great teacher Ben-Asher", without the usual benedictory phrase "his rest is in Paradise, which accompanies the mention of the departed," yields additional evidence that

¹ Comp. the Epigraph בנן עדן וחו בנן אשר בן משה בן in the St Petersburg Codex of A. D. 1009.

the Massorah in question was written in the life-time of Ben-Asher.

With these preliminary notices before us we shall be better prepared to enter into an examination of the differences between Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali which are recorded in the official Lists. The Massoretico-Grammatical Treatise which is prefixed to the Yemen MSS. of the Pentateuch give the most lucid Summary of these differences not only with regard to certain words which occur in sundry parts of the Bible, but especially in the Pentateuch. With regard to the Pentateuch it describes most minutely the precise nature and the exact number of these variations in each of the fifty-two Pericopes into which it is divided. The differences between these two redactors of the text which affect words occurring throughout the Bible are given in this Treatise under the following six categories.

I. The proper name יששכר which with its different prefixes occurs forty-three times in the Bible¹ constitutes the first point of difference. According to Ben-Asher the first w only is pointed and is pronounced Sin (ש) and the second is entirely passed over being neither pointed nor pronounced, viz. יששכר Isachar; whilst according to Ben-Naphtali both are pointed and pronounced, viz. יששכר Issachar.² It will be seen that according to this Treatise

¹ Gen. XXX 18; XXXV 23; XLVI 13; XLIX 14; Exod. I 3; Numb. I 8, 28, 29; II 5, 5; VII 18; X 15; XIII 7; XXVI 23, 25; XXXIV 26; Deut. XXVII 12; XXXIII 18; Josh. XVII 10, II; XIX 17, 17, 23; XXI 6, 28; Judg. V 15, 15; X 1; 1 Kings IV 17; XV 27; Ezek. XLVIII 25, 26, 33; 1 Chron. II 1; VI 47, 57; VII 1, 5; XII 33, 41; XXVI 5; XXVII 18; 2 Chron. XXX 18.

דע כי היה בן אשר ינקוד משלת יששכר השין ויוציא אותו בסין וישבית דע כי דע כי דע כי דע דע דע ינקוד מלת ישקבית וביש ישקבי ובי דע זה המנהג; ובן נפתלי השין השני מן הנקוד ולא יוציא אותו בפה כמו יִשְּׁשֶׁבְּר יחוֹים יווציאם בסינין כמו יִשְּשֶׁבְּר Orient. 2348, fol. 25 a; Orient. 2349, fol. 16 a; Orient. 2350, fol. 23 a—b; Derenbourg, Manuel de Lecteur, p. 109, Paris 1871.

the Sin which Ben-Asher points has no Dagesh and this reading is exhibited in MSS. Nos. 65, 68, 80, 122 &c. of the St. Petersburg Collection. In the Adath Deborim where the same fact is recorded, the remark about Ben-Asher is almost identical, but the point of difference on the part of Ben-Naphtali is entirely at variance with the statement here, inasmuch as it says that Ben-Naphtali pronounces the first Shin (v) and the second Sin (v), viz. יששכר Ishsashar, and that it is Moses Mochah who points and reads it יששכר Issachar with two Sins.2 יששכר Ishsachar, which is here stated to be the orthography of Ben-Naphtali is the reading of MSS. Nos. 49, 54, 57, 59, 70 &c. in the St. Petersburg Collection,3 whilst וששבר Issachar, which is here stated to be the orthography of Moses Mochah is the reading of Codex Nr. 110 in the same collection. There is yet another record about Ben-Naphtali's orthography of this name. In the Treatise entitled Points of Difference between the Karaite and Rabbinic Jews we are assured that Ben-Naphtali reads it משכר and this is confirmed by the Massorah Parva on Gen. XXX 18 in Orient. 2626-28 in the British Museum. These, however, do not exhaust all the varieties in the orthography of this name as exhibited in the MSS. The St. Petersburg Codex which is dated A. D. 916 reads its יששַׂכֶר without points in the first w in all the passages in Ezekiel (XLVIII

י Comp. Harkavy and Strack, Catalog, pp. 71, 82, 84, 86, 93 &c ובן נפתלי יחליף אותו משום כי ינקוד הב' ויוציא הראשון בשין והשני בסין בסין במין ובקראם בב' ויקראם בב' טינים במ' יִשְׁשֶׁכֶּר וינהיג הכול [על] זה המנהג, ומשה מוחה היה מנקד הב' ויקראם בב' טינים במ' יִשְׁשֶּׁכֶר, ווה חלופם בוו המלה: Comp. Strack, Codex Babylonicus, p. 29, St. Petersburg 1876. According to Pinsker, however, Moses b. Mochah reads it יִשְׁשֶּׁכֶר Comp. Lickute Kadmoniot, p. 98, Vienna 1880, so that here too the statement in the Adath Deborim is at variance with other records.

³ Comp. Harkavy and Strack, Catalog, pp. 90, 92, 104, 155 &c.

⁴ Comp. לקומי קרמוניות in Pinsker's הלומ הקראים והרבנים, p. 102, Vienna 1860.

25, 26, 33) and this is also the reading in the Pentateuch in Arund. Orient. 2 which is dated A. D. 1216.

We have thus no fewer than six varieties in the orthography of this name exhibited in the MSS. and in the early editions.

- (ו) יְשְּׁשֶׁרֶּר with Dagesh in the Sin Add. 4445; Add. 15451; Add. 9401; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Orient. 2348; Orient. 2349; Orient. 2350; Orient. 4227; the Complutensian Polyglot; the Rabbinic Bible by Felix Pratensis 1517; the Venice quarto Bible 1521 and the editio princeps of the Bible with the Massorah by Jacob b. Chayim 1524—25.
- (2) יְשִׂשְּׁכְר without Dagesh in the Sin, Ben-Asher, Orient. 2201; Harley 5710-11; Harley 1528; MSS. Nos. 65, 68, 80, 122 &c.; in the St. Petersburg Collection; the first edition of the Pentateuch, Bologna 1482; the first edition of the entire Bible, Soncino 1488; the second edition, Naples 1491—93; and the third edition, Brescia 1494.
- (3) ישׁשְׂכֶּר the first Sin without vowel points, the Babylon Codex A. D. 916; and Arund. Orient. 2 dated A. D. 1216.
- (4) יְשְׁשֶׁכְּר with vowel points under both Sins, Moses b. Mocha and MS. No. 100 in the St. Petersburg Collection.
- (5) ששכר Ben-Naphtali.

252

(6) יְשְׁשְׂרֶר also given as Ben-Naphtali, is the orthography in MSS. Nos. 49, 54, 57, 59, 70 &c. in the St. Petersburg Collection.

These variations which have no parallel in any other proper name among the sons of Jacob are due both to the birth of Issachar and to the part he played in the history of the twelve tribes. The original orthography was undoubtedly יְשָׂא שָׂכָר = יִשְׂשֶׂכְר which denotes he bringeth

reward, referring to Gen. XXX 18, and he taketh or receiveth. hire (comp. Ps. XXIV 5; Eccl. V 18; Esther II 9 &c.), alluding to Gen. XLIX 14, 15. A similar instance of the double signification of a name, the first referring to the circumstances connected with the birth and the second alluding to events in after-life, we have in the case of the father of Issachar. He is called Jacob (ישלב) = Heel-catcher, because at the birth he caught hold of his brother's heel (Gen. XXV 26), and he is afterwards Jacob (יעלב) = Trickster, because he deliberately tricked him out of his paternal blessing (Gen. XXVII 36). It is the latter circumstance which underlies all the variations in the orthography. Owing to his love of ease and comfort Issachar we are here told preferred to recognise the supreme power of the original inhabitants of the land and pay tribute rather than engage in the struggle to expel them, as the other tribes were endeavouring to do. For this reason Jacob brands him as a hireling, a burden-bearer to strangers:

Issachar [= the hireling] is the ass of strangers, Couching down among the folds;
When he saw the rest that it was good
And the land that it was pleasant
He bowed his shoulder to bear the burden
And became a servant unto tribute.

In after time when this stigma cast upon Issachar [= the hireling] wounded the national susceptibilities, all sorts of interpretations were resorted to, to conceal or obliterate this censure, as will be seen from the ancient versions and the variations in the vowel-points of the text itself adopted by different redactors.

Hence the variations in the orthography of יששכר Issachar, have been adopted by the different redactors to preclude the meaning he taketh hire, i. e hireling. the ass of strangers, which was the original reading, as is attested both by the Samaritan text and the Samaritan Targum, has been altered in the Septuagint into τὸ καλὸν έπεθύμησεν = מֵכֵר נֵרַם he desired that which is good, substituting Daleth (7) for Resh (7) in the first word and Samech (D) for Mem (D) in the second. What this good represents is manifest from the Jerusalem Targum II, which exhibits the same alteration of letters and which renders it = חמר גרם המיד באורייתא he desired the Law. The Jerusalem Targum I paraphrases it שׁבְטֵא חַקּיף a strong tribe, whilst Onkelos renders it עָהִיר בְּנְכְסִין rich in wealth. As for the stigma that he became "a servant unto tribute" the Septuagint makes it into γεωργός a husbandman. The Jerusalem Targum paraphrases it "his brethren shall bring him presents because he bowed his shoulder to master the Law," whilst Onkelos makes this clause say the very opposite to that which the Hebrew text declares. According to the Chaldee Version it means "he will conquer the provinces of the nations, destroy their inhabitants, and those that remain will serve him and render him tribute."2 To such expedients have the ancient Versions and the redactors of the Massoretic text resorted in order to obscure and obliterate the otherwise plain meaning of the faithfully transmitted consonants.3

In the ten passages where Issachar occurs in Chronicles (1 Chron. II 1; VI 47, 57; VII 1, 5; XII 23, 41; XXVI 5;

ים מסקי והוו ליה אחוי מסקי למלעי באורייתא והוו ליה אחוי מסקי ורונין. ורונין

יהון יהון לה פלחין וראשתארון בהון יהון לה פלחין יהון לה מסקי מסין.

³ For a full discussion on the alterations and import of this passage we must refer to Geiger, Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel, 359 etc., Breslau 1857; Zeitschrift der Deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft, XVIII, 658 etc., Leipzig 1864; Jüdische Zeitschrift für Wissenschaft und Leben, X, 101, Breslau 1872.

XXVII 18; 2 Chron. XXX 18), I have omitted to give in the Notes the usual variant of Ben-Naphtali. The student must, therefore, bear in mind the alternative orthography.

II. The second point of difference between Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali is with regard to certain forms of the verb 50 to eat. According to Ben-Asher wherever a form of this verb occurs with a suffix and the Lamed has Segol (5), the Caph has Chateph-pathach (5), except in one instance (Eccl. V 10), whereas Ben-Naphtali always points it with simple Sheva (5). There are only six forms of this verb which are affected in the vowel-points by this variation. But as they respectively occur more than once, amounting altogether to twenty-four instances, and, moreover, as several of the identical forms are treated differently in the same MSS. and early editions, it is necessary to describe each passage separately in the order of the books in which they occur.

It is only by so doing that Ben-Asher's rule can properly be tested. The importance of this minute examination will be seen when it is stated that some textual critics have maintained that the punctation of these forms constitutes a test whether a given MS. exhibits the Ben-Asher or Ben-Naphtali recension.

In the examination of the passages which exhibit the forms of this verb I am obliged to separate the fifteen instances in the Pentateuch from the nine which occur in the Prophets and in the Hagiographa, since many of the MSS. which I have collated for this purpose only contain the Pentateuch, whilst several have the Prophets and the Hagiographa without the Pentateuch.

יוכל לשון אכילה היה בן אשר יפתח הכף על המשפטים שביארנו בסימני בכי וכל לשון אכילה היה בן אשר יפתח הכף על המשפטים שביארנו בסימנה כסיים. Comp. Orient. 2348, fol. 25a; Orient. 2349, fol. 16a; Orient. 2350, fol. 23b; Derenbourg, Manuel du Lecleur, p. 109, Paris 1871.

The Pentateuch. — The following ten MSS. have only the Pentateuch: Arund. Orient. 2; Orient. 2348; Orient. 2349; Orient. 2350; Orient. 2365; Orient. 2451; Orient. 2696; Orient. 4445; Add. 9401; and Add. 15282.

(1) Gen. III 17.

אבליה Add. 9401 dated A. D. 1286; Add. 15451; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Add. 15282; Orient. 2626; the Lisbon edition of the Pentateuch 1491; the second edition of the Bible, Naples 1491—93; the Complutensian Polyglot; and the first edition of the Bible with the Massorah by Jacob b. Chayim 1524—25.

Orient. 4445, the oldest MS. known at present;
Orient. 2201 dated A. D. 1246; Orient. 2348; Orient.
2349; Orient. 2350; Orient. 2365; Orient. 4227; Orient.
2451; Orient. 2629; Harley 5710—11; Harley 1528;
the editio princeps of the Pentateuch, Bologna 1482;
the first edition of the Hebrew Bible, Soncino 1488;
the third edition of the Bible, Brescia 1494; the
Rabbinic Bible by Felix Pratensis 1517; and the
Venice quarto edition 1521. For the treatment of
the same form in Ezek. IV 12 which is the only
other instance where it occurs, see below No. 20.

(2) Levit. VI 11.

יאּכֶלֶנה Add. 4445; Add. 9401; Add. 15451; and the first edition of the Bible, Soncino 1488.

יאכלנה Arund. Orient. 2 dated A. D. 1216; Orient. 2201; Orient. 2348; Orient. 2349; Orient. 2350; Orient. 2365; Orient. 2451; Orient. 2626; Orient. 2696; Orient. 4227; Harley 1528; Harley 5710—11; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Add. 15282; the first edition of the Pentateuch, Bologna 1482; the Lisbon edition of the Pentateuch 1491; the second edition of the Bible, Naples 1491—93; the third edition, Brescia

1494; the Complutensian Polyglot; the Rabbinic Bible by Felix Pratensis 1517; the Venice quarto 1521; and the first edition of the Bible with the Massorah by Jacob b. Chayim 1524-25.

(3) Levit. VI 19.

יאכלנה Orient. 4445; Add. 9401; Add. 15282; Add. 15451.

יאכלנה Arund. Orient. 2; Orient. 2201; Orient. 2348; Orient. 2349; Orient. 2350; Orient. 2365; Orient. 2451; Orient. 2626; Orient. 2696; Orient. 4227; Harley 1528; Harley 5710—11; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; the first edition of the Pentateuch, Soncino 1482; the first edition of the Bible 1488; the Lisbon edition of the Pentateuch 1491; the second edition of the Bible, Naples 1491-93; the third edition, Brescia 1494; the Complutensian Polyglot; the Rabbinic Bible by Felix Pratensis 1517; the Venice quarto Bible 1521; and the first edition of the Bible with the Massorah 1524-25.

(4) Levit. VII 6.

יאכלנה Orient. 4445; Add. 9401; Add. 15282; the first edition of the Bible, Soncino 1488; and the third edition, Brescia 1494.

אכלנה Arund. Orient. 2; Orient. 2201; Orient. 2348; Orient. 2349; Orient. 2350; Orient. 2365; Orient. 2451; Orient. 2626; Orient. 2696; Orient. 4227; Harley 1528; Harley 5710—11; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; the first edition of the Pentateuch, Bologna 1482; the Lisbon edition 1491; the second edition of the Bible, Naples 1491-93; the Complutensian Polyglot; the Rabbinic Bible by Felix Pratensis 1517; the Venice quarto Bible 1521; and the first edition of the Bible with the Massorah by Jacob b. Chayim 1524-25. R

תאכלנו Orient. 4445; Add. 9401; Add. 15451; Orient. 2696.

תאכלנו Arund. Orient. 2; Orient. 2201; Orient. 2348; Orient. 2349; Orient. 2350; Orient. 2365; Orient. 2451; Orient 2626; Orient. 4227; Harley 1528; Harley 5710—11; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Add. 15282; the editio princeps of the Pentateuch, Bologna 1482; the editio princeps of the Bible, Soncino 1488; the Lisbon edition of the Pentateuch 1491; the second edition of the Bible, Naples 1491-93; the

third edition, Brescia 1494; the Complutensian Polyglot; the Rabbinic Bible by Felix Pratensis 1517; the Venice quarto Bible 1521; and the first

CHAP. X

edition of the Bible with the Massorah by Jacob b. Chayim 1524 - 25. (6) Numb. XVIII 13.

2696. אכלנו 'Arund. Orient. 2; Orient. 2201; Orient. 2348; Orient. 2349; Orient. 2350; Orient. 2365; Orient. 2451; Orient. 2626; Orient. 4227; Harley 1528; Harley 5710—11; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Add.

יאכלנו Orient. 4445; Add. 9401; Add. 15451; Orient.

15282; and all the early editions of the Pentateuch

Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Add. 15282; and all the

and the Bible. (7) Deut. XII 15.

יאכלנו Add. 9401; Add. 15451; Orient. 2696. יאכלנו Orient. 2201; Orient. 2348; Orient. 2349; Orient. 2350; Orient. 2365; Orient. 2451; Orient. 2626; Orient. 4227; Harley 1528; Harley 5710-11; Add. 15250;

early editions of the Pentateuch and the Bible. (8) Deut. XII 18.

תאכלנו Add. 9401; Add. 15451; Orient. 2696.

חאקלנו Orient. 2201; Orient. 2348; Orient. 2349; Orient. 2350; Orient. 2365; Orient. 2451; Orient. 2626; Orient. 4227; Harley 1528; Harley 5710—11; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Add. 15282; and all the early editions of the Pentateuch and the Bible.

(9) Deut. XII 22.

תאבלנו Add. 9401; Add. 15451; Orient. 2696.

תאקלנו Orient. 2201; Orient. 2348; Orient. 2349; Orient. 2350; Orient. 2365; Orient. 2451; Orient. 2626; Orient. 4227; Harley 1528; Harley 5710—11; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Add. 15282; and all the early editions of the Pentateuch and the Bible.

(10) Deut. XII 22.

יאבֶלְנו Add. 9401; Add. 15451; Orient. 2696.

יאַכְלְנוּ Orient. 2201; Orient 2348; Orient. 2349; Orient. 2350; Orient. 2365; Orient. 2451; Orient. 2626; Orient. 4227; Harley 1528; Harley 5710—11; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Add. 15282; and all the early editions of the Pentateuch and the Bible.

(11) Deut. XII 24.

תאכלנו Add. 9401; Add. 15451; Orient. 2696.

תאקלנו Orient. 2201; Orient. 2348; Orient. 2349; Orient. 2350; Orient. 2365; Orient. 2451; Orient. 2626; Orient. 4227; Harley 1528; Harley 5710—11; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Add. 15282; and all the early editions of the Pentateuch and the Bible.

(12) Deut. XII 25.

תאבֶלֶנו Add. 9401; Add. 15451; Orient. 2696.

תאקלנו Orient. 2201; Orient. 2348; Orient. 2349; Orient. 2350; Orient. 2365; Orient. 2451; Orient. 2626; Orient. 4227; Harley 1528; Harley 5710—11; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Add. 15282; and all the early editions of the Pentateuch and the Bible.

(13) Deut. XV 20.

תאבֶלֶנו Add. 9401; Add. 15451; Orient. 2696; Orient. 4227.

תאכלנו Arund. Orient. 2; Orient. 2201; Orient. 2348; Orient. 2349; Orient. 2350; Orient. 2365; Orient. 2451; Orient. 2626; Harley 1528; Harley 5710—11; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15282; and all the early editions of the Pentateuch and the Bible.

(14) Deut. XV 22.

תאבֶלֶנו Add. 9401; Add. 15451; Add. 15282; Orient. 2696.
Arund. Orient. 2; Orient. 2201; Orient. 2348;

Orient. 2349; Orient. 2350; Orient. 2365; Orient. 2451; Orient. 2626; Orient. 4227; Harley 1528; Harley 5710-11; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; and all the early editions of the Pentateuch and the Bible.

(15) Deut. XXVIII 39.

תאכלנו Add. 9401; Add. 15451.

סויפתו. 2201; Orient. 2348; Orient. 2349; Orient. 2350; Orient. 2365; Orient. 2451; Orient. 2626; Orient. 2696; Orient. 4227; Harley 1528; Harley 5710—11; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Add. 15282; and all the early editions of the Pentateuch and the Bible. It is to be added that Orient. 4445 and Arund. Orient. 16 point it ארבלנו with Tzere under the Lamed.

The Prophets and the Hagiographa. — To the MSS. which contain the whole Bible and which are quoted both for the Pentateuch and these two divisions of the Scriptures, I have here to add the following Codices: the two magnificent model MSS. Arund. Orient. 16 and Orient. 2091 which contain the Prophets and the Hagiographa; Orient. 2210

and Orient. 2370 which contain the Former Prophets; Orient. 1474 which contains the Latter Prophets and Orient. 2212 which contains the Hagiographa.

- (16) 2 Kings VI 28.
 - ונאכֶלֶנו Add. 15451.
 - ואקלנו Orient. 2091; Orient 2201; Orient. 2310; Orient. 2370; Orient. 2626 28; Orient. 4227; Arund. Orient. 16; Harley 1528; Harley 5710—11; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; and all the early editions of the Bible.
- (17) 2 Kings VI 29.

ונאבֶלֶנוּ Add. 15451. Orient 2001

ונאקלנו (Orient. 2091; Orient. 2201; Orient. 2210; Orient. 2370; Orient. 2626—28; Orient. 4227; Arund. Orient. 16; Harley 1528; Harley 5710—11; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; and all the early editions of the Bible.

- (18) Isa. XXXI 8.
 - תאבֶלֶנו Add. 15251; Add. 15451.

Orient. 1474; Orient. 2201; Orient. 2626 – 28; Orient. 4227; Arund. Orient. 16; Harley 1528; Harley 5710 11; Add. 15250; Add. 15252; and all the early editions of the Bible.

- (19) Ezek. IV 9.
- חאבלנו Orient. 2201; Add. 15451; and the first edition of the Rabbinic Bible with the Massorah by Jacob b. Chayim 1524—25.
 - Orient. 1474; Orient. 2091; Orient. 2626 28; Orient. 4227; Harley 1528; Harley 5710—11; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; and all the early editions of the Bible with the exception of the editio princeps with the Massorah by Jacob b. Chayim.

(20 and 21) Ezek. IV 10.

תאבֶלְנוּ twice Orient. 2201; Add. 15451; the fourth edition of the Bible 1511—17; and Jacob b. Chayim's edition 1524—25.

Orient. 1474; Orient. 2091; Orient. 2626—28; Orient. 4227; Harley 1528; Harley 5710—11; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; the first edition of the Bible, Soncino 1488; the second edition, Naples 1491—93; the third edition, Brescia 1494; the Complutensian Polyglot; the Rabbinic Bible by Felix Pratensis 1517; and the Venice quarto Bible 1521.

(22) Ezek. IV 12.

Orient. 2201; Harley 1528; Add. 15251; Add. 15451; the fourth edition of the Bible, Pesaro 1511—17; the Complutensian Polyglot; and the first edition of the Bible with the Massorah by Jacob b. Chayim 1524—25.

Orient. 1474; Orient. 2091; Orient. 2626—28; Orient. 4227; Harley 5710—11; Add. 15250; Add. 15252; the first edition of the Bible, Soncino 1488; the second edition, Naples 1491—93; the third edition, Brescia 1494; the Rabbinic Bible by Felix Pratensis 1517; and the Venice quarto 1521.

(23) Ezek. VII 15.

יאכֶלנו Add. 15451.

יאּכְלֶנוּ Orient. 1474; Orient. 2091; Orient. 2201; Orient. 2626—28; Orient. 4227; Harley 1528; Harley 5710—11; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; and all the early editions of the Bible.

(24) Eccl. VI 2.

יאבֶלְנו not a single MS.

יאכלְנו Orient. 2091; Orient. 2201; Orient. 2212; Orient. 2626—28; Orient. 4227; Arund. Orient. 16; Harley

1528; Harley 5710—11; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; and all the early editions of the Bible.

The above analysis discloses the startling fact that by far the greater number of our MSS. and the early editions follow the Ben-Naphtali recension and not that of Ben-Asher as has hitherto been supposed. It shows that out of the fifteen instances which occur in the Pentateuch and for which I collated nineteen MSS. and nine early editions, the Ben-Asher reading has some considerable support in No. 1 alone. It has eight MSS. and four editions in its favour. But even here the Ben-Naphtali recension is exhibited in no fewer than eleven MSS. and five editions. In all the other fourteen passages the Ben-Asher reading is exhibited in only two, three or at most in four MSS., whilst the Ben-Naphtali recension is uniformly followed in fourteen or fifteen MSS. and in twelve passages it is the reading of all the early editions without exception.

A similar result is obtained from the analysis of the instances in the Prophets and Hagiographa. Out of the thirteen MSS, which I have collated for these divisions of the Hebrew Bible, the highest number which support Ben-Asher's recension is in the single instance described in No. 22. Here Ben-Asher's reading is exhibited in four MSS, and in four editions. But here too Ben-Naphtali's recension has the greater support, inasmuch as it is exhibited in seven MSS, and five editions. In the other eight passages Ben-Asher's recension is followed by only one MS, or at most by two MSS. In the case of No. 24 not a single MS, or edition follows Ben-Asher, whilst Ben-Naphtali's recension is exhibited in seven to thirteen MSS, and in five out of the nine instances is followed by all the early editions and in No. 19 by all the editions except one.

With this overwhelming evidence before me I did not feel justified in displacing the simple Sheva from the text

(3) in these forms and in substituting for it Chateph-pathach (3). The exception, however, which I have made is in Ezek. IV 10—12. Here as will be seen from the above analysis, this form is not only exhibited in several MSS., but in several of the early editions. In these passages, however, I have given the alternative punctuation in the notes.

III. The third point of difference between Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali is with regard to certain forms of the verb לו to drive away. As in the former case so here, wherever the forms of this verb occur with a suffix and the third radical has Segol (v), Ben-Asher points the second radical with Chateph-pathach (7) with one exception, viz. ויגרשהו and he drove him away (Ps. XXXIV I), where he also points the Resh with Chateph-pathach, though the Shin has Tzere; whereas Ben-Naphtali always points the Resh with simple Sheva (7).1 Apart from the exception in Ps. XXXIV 1, there are only three passages which are affected by this difference between these two Massorites. From an examination of these three passages, however, it will be seen that the vowel-points of Ben-Naphtali are the rule both in the MSS. and in the early editions, whereas those of Ben-Asher are the exception.

(1) Exod. XXIII 29.

264

אנרְשָׁנוּ Orient 4445; Add. 9401; Add. 15282; Add. 15451.

אנרשנו Orient. 2201; Orient. 2348; Orient. 2349; Orient. 2350; Orient. 2365; Orient. 2451; Orient. 2626—28;

י וכל לשון נרושה היה בן אשר יפתח הריש והוא שיהיה תחת השין שלש נקדות כמו מעט מעט אנרשֶנוּ, לא אנרְשֶׁנוּ מפניך ווולתם, ואם לא יהיה על השין שלש נקדות כמו מעט מעט אנרְשֶׁנוּ, לא אנרְשֶׁנוּ מפניך ווולתם, וחנְרְשני מבית ודומ׳ חוץ ממלה נקדות לא יפתח הריש כמו וינדלו בני האשה וינָרְשוֹ והיא וינְרַשֵּׁהוּ וילך; ובן אחת כי הוא יפתח אותה ולא יהיה תחת השין שלוש נקדות והיא וינְרַשֵּׁהוּ וילך; ובן Comp. Orient. 2348, fol. 25a—b; Orient. 2349, fol. 16a; Orient. 2350, fol. 23b; Derenbourg, Manuel du Lecteur, page 109, Paris 1871.

Orient. 2696; Orient. 4227; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Harley 1528; Harley 5710—11; the editio princeps of the Pentateuch, Bologna 1482; the first edition of the Bible, Soncino 1488; the Lisbon Pentateuch 1491; the second edition of the Bible, Naples 1491—93; the third edition, Brescia 1494; the Complutensian Polyglot; the Rabbinic Bible by Felix Pratensis 1517; the Venice quarto 1521; and the first edition of the Bible with the Massorah by Jacob b. Chayim 1524—25.

(2) Exod. XXIII 30.

אורֶישֶׁנוּ Orient. 4445; Add. 9401; Add. 15282; Add. 15451.

אברשנו Orient. 2201; Orient. 2348; Orient. 2349; Orient. 2350; Orient. 2365; Orient. 2451; Orient. 2626—28; Orient. 2696; Orient. 4227; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Harley 1528; Harley 5710—11; and all the early editions without exception.

(3) Numb. XXII 6.

ואגרישנו Orient. 4445; Add. 9401; Add. 15282; Add. 15451; and the third edition of the Bible, Brescia 1494.

ואגרְשָׁנוּ Orient. 2201; Orient. 2348; Orient. 2349; Orient. 2350; Orient. 2365; Orient. 2451; Orient. 2626—28; Orient. 2696; Orient. 4227; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Harley 1528; Harley 5710—11; and all

the early editions except one, viz. Brescia 1494.

We now come to the exception where we are told that Ben-Asher points it וינרְשָׁהוּ with Chateph-pathach under the Resh (תַ) though the Shin has Tzere (שָׁ). From the following description, however, it will be seen that here too the reading of Ben-Naphtali is the rule in the MSS. and in the early editions, whilst the recension of Ben-Asher is very rarely followed.

Ps. XXXIV 1.

ויגרשהו Add. 15251; Add. 15451.

רנרְשָׁהוּ Orient. 2201; Orient. 2212; Orient. 2375; Orient. 2451; Orient. 2626—28; Orient. 4227; Arund. Orient. 16; Harley 1528; Harley 5710—11; Add. 15250; Add. 15252; and all the early editions without a single exception.

My own Codex No. I which is a beautifully written Spanish MS. and which also has ויגרשהו in the text, distinctly states in the official List of variations that the difference consists in Ben-Asher reading it שונרשהו with Gaya, and this variation I have given in the note on this passage.

IV. The fourth point on which Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali differ is with regard to the Dagesh in the Tav in the forms of the word מולים houses, when it has two accents. According to Ben-Asher the word in question occurs only twice with two accents and hence the Tav has Dagesh in only two instances, viz. יוֹם and houses Deut. VI וו and יוֹם the houses thereof וו Chron. XXVIII וו. This is evident from his statement in the Massorah that there are only four words altogether in the Bible which have the two accents and Dagesh in the Tav and that the form houses, constitutes two out of the four instances. According to Ben-Naphtali, however, there are more instances where the form houses, has two accents and has the extra Dagesh in the Tav, viz. Exod. II 7; VIII 7;

יותר לשון בתים אשר יהיה בשני מעמים היה כן נפתלי יחזקם ברנש יותר מזולתם כמו על הַבְּהַים, וּמְבְּהֵּים לחלים על זה המנהנ: ובן אשר יחליפהו על זה חוץ מזולתם כמו על הַבְּהִים מלאים כל מוב, את תבנית האולם ואת בְּּתִּיו, כי זכר משתי מלות והיא וּבְּתִּים מלאי, ואת בְּתִּיו, והן וּבְתִּים מלאי, ואת בְּתִירון: Comp. Orient. 2348, fol. 25b; Orient. 2349, fol. 16a; Orient. 2350, fol. 23b; Derenbourg, Manuel du Lecteur, p. 110, Paris 1871.

Deut. VI 11; 1 Chron. XXVIII 11; 2 Chron. XXXIV 11. Here too both the MSS. and the early editions follow the recension of Ben-Naphtali, inasmuch as they exhibit the accent and Dagesh in all the five passages.

V. The fifth point of difference between these two Massorites is with regard to the prefixes Beth (2) and Lamed (5) in words which begin with a Yod which has a Chirek (*). According to Ben-Asher the prefix in question takes Sheva and the Yod retains the Chirek. Thus ישׂראל Israel is לישראל in Israel, and לישראל to Israel; יורעאל to Israel; Jezreel with the prefix Beth is ביזרעאל in Jezreel, with Lamed it is ליזרעאל to Jezreel; יראה fear with the prefix Beth is in fear, and with Lamed it is ליראה to fear. According to Ben-Naphtali, however, the Chirek in question is taken by the prefix Beth or Lamed and the Yod loses its character as a consonant, ישׂרָאֵל with the prefix becomes בִּישׂרָאֵל or לישראל; so too יוַרעאל becomes לישראל or ליוַרעאל and יראה with the prefixes becomes ביראה and לִירָאָה.¹ As this pointing which affects hundreds of passages is in accordance with the Syriac, it seems to confirm Levita's statement that Ben-Naphtali belonged to the Madinchai or Eastern School of textual critics.2

In this category of differences between the two textual critics, the MSS. and the editions with very few exceptions follow the recension of Ben-Asher. We shall only mention two noticeable exceptions, since one of them has given rise to a difference in the interpretation of the text,

יות ביראת לישראל ביראת ביראת ביראת ביראת ביראת ליראת. ביראת היות וכל בישראל לישראל, ביות ביראת ביראת ביראת בקוד היוד באלו המלות ויוציא אותו בפה, ובן נפתלי יחליפהו ולא ינקוד היוד באלו באלו בפה באלו בישְּרָאֵל: Comp. Orient. 2348; fol. 25b; Orient. 2349, fol. 16a; Orient. 2350, fol. 23b; Derenbourg, Manuel du Lecteur, p. 110; Paris 1871.

² Vide supra p. 247; and Levita, Massoreth Ha-Massoreth, p. 114, ed. Ginsburg.

viz. Ps. XLV 10. Though I have adopted in the text בְּלְּרְוֹתְיֹךְ among thy honourable women, which is the reading of Ben-Asher, in accordance with some of the best MSS., viz. Harley 5710—11; Arund. Orient. 16; Orient. 2375; Orient. 2451; Orient. 4227; Add. 15251, I must state that the majority of the MSS. which I have collated and the early editions exhibit בִּיקְרוֹתִיךְ, the recension of Ben-Naphtali. This is the case in Orient. 2201; Orient. 2212; Orient. 2626—28; Add. 9401—2; Add. 15250; Add. 15252; Add. 15451; Harley 1528; and all the early editions without a single exception. Hence the mediaeval Jewish interpreters (Saadia, Rashi &c.), who followed this reading, ignored the silent Yod and derived the word from בּקר to visit, to serve. They took it as the plural of בּקר (Levit. XIX 20) and translated it thy female servants.

The second instance where the Ben-Naphtali recension has prevailed over the Ben-Asher reading is Prov. XXX 17. The reading notified in Ben-Asher reading is Prov. XXX 17. The reading notified in Orient. 2201; Orient. 2212; Orient. 2375; Orient. 2626—28; Orient. 4227; Arund. Orient. 16; Harley 1528; Harley 5710—11; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Add. 21161 and in fact in all the Standard Codices which I have collated for this purpose. The same is the case with the editions. All the early editions without exception have this reading. With this overwhelming evidence before me I did not feel justified in displacing it from the text and substituting for it Ben-Asher's recension for which I could not find any authority.

VI. The sixth point of difference between Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali affects the presence or absence of the Dagesh in the letters בגרכפת under certain conditions. According to Ben-Asher, wherever וַיִּהְי is followed by

¹ Comp. Ewald and Dukes, Beiträge, p. 36 etc.

and the accent connects it with בנדכפת he has it Raphe in accordance with the rule which applies to אוֹיה. Thus for instance he reads it ויהי כשמע Gen. XXIX 13; and so in similar cases. Now Ben-Naphtali differs from him in the following seven instances where he puts Dagesh in Caph after יוהי Gen. XIX 17; XXXIX 15; Deut. II 16; Josh. IX 1; Judg. XI 35; 1 Kings XV 29; and Esther V 2.1

We have still to consider the official Lists of the differences between Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali which record the variants in each book separately under each of the three great divisions, viz. the Law, the Prophets and the Hagiographa.

The Pentateuch. — As is usually the case, the Scribes have taken the greatest care in minutely recording the variations which obtained in the Pentateuch between these two redactors of the text. Hence in some MSS. not only is the precise number of variations given in each Pericope, but the nature of the difference is minutely described. This is notably the case in the splendid Codex No. 1 in the Madrid University Library dated A. D. 1280, folio 81a—82b; in the Massoretico-Grammatical Treatise prefixed to the Yemen MSS. of the Pentateuch: Orient. 1379; Orient. 2348; Orient. 2349 and Orient. 2350 in the British Museum, and in the Mukaddimat of Samuel Ha-Rophē.

Samuel Ha-Rophē or Samuel el-Maghrebi was born in Maghrebi circa A. D. 1350 and died circa A. D. 1420. He was *Dayin* or Spiritual head of the Karaite community

יקראם אשר יקראם ויהי היה בן אשר יקראם בנד כפת והטעם מודבק עם ויהי היה בן אשר יקראם ברפי על משפט אויה כמו ויהי כשמע ודומ׳, ובן נפתלי יחליפהו בשבעה מלות ויהי ברפי על משפט אויה כראות המלך, ויהי כשמעו כי הרימתי, ויהי כאשר תמו, ויהי כדאות המלכים, ויהי כמלכו, וחוץ מאלו ינהינם על משפט אויה כהוציאם אתם, ויהי כשמע כל המלכים, ויהי כמלכו, וחוץ מאלו ינהינם על משפט אויה כל הנפלים, ויהי דוד ודומ׳: Comp. Orient. 2348, fol. 25b; Orient. 2349, fol. 16a; Orient. 2350, fol. 23b; Derenbourg, Manuel du Lecteur, p. 110, Paris 1871.

at Cairo. Amongst other works he wrote circa 1380 the Mukaddimat or Introduction to the Pericopes of the Pentateuch.1 At the end of each Mukaddima he not only gives a description in Arabic of the number of Sedarim and verses in the Pericope in question, but gives a table in which he registers both the exact number of the variations between Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali and the precise nature of each variant. This portion of the Mukaddimat is of great importance, inasmuch as its author by virtue of his position and office had the command of the celebrated Ben-Asher Codex which his community at Cairo possessed. It is from the Mukaddimat that I printed in my Massorah the portion which sets forth the variations between Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali.2 The Lists of the differences between these two textual critics appended to each of the Pericopes in my edition of the Bible are also from the Mukaddimat, collated with the Lists in the Madrid Codex No. 1 and the Massoretico-Grammatical Treatise in the Yemen MSS.

Owing to the special care which the Scribes exercised with regard to the Massoretic materials appertaining to the Pentateuch, some MSS. which contain the whole Hebrew Bible and omit the Lists for the Prophets and Hagiographa, yet carefully record the Lists for the Pentateuch. This is the case in Orient. 2201 which is dated A. D. 1246, fol. 100a—101b; Orient. 4227, fol. 270a—271a; Add. 15251, fol. 3b—5b; in the splendidly illuminated MS. Orient. 2626—28, Vol. I, fol. 180a—184b; and MS. No. 7 dated A. D. 1299 in the National Library, Paris. Besides these MSS. which give the Lists for the Pentateuch alone, I have also collated Harley 1528 in the British Museum; my

¹ Comp. Fürst, Geschichte des Karäerthums, Vol. II, p. 283 etc., Leipzig 1865.

² Comp. The Massorah, Vol. III, § 290b—298b, p. 6-14.

own MS. No. 1; the Lists in the editio princeps of Jacob b. Chayim's Bible with the Massorah, Vol. IV, Venice 1525—26 at the end; and the Lists in Walton's Polyglot, Vol. VI, p. 8—13, London 1657. The List of the variations given in the Summary at the end of each Pericope in my edition of the Bible I printed from the Mukaddimat or Liturgical Introduction to the Pericopes by Samuel Ha-Rophē al-Maghridi, Orient. 2482—84; compared with the Massoretico-Grammatical Treatise prefixed to the above-named Yemen MSS. and with the List in the Madrid Codex No. 1.

Genesis. — In the Lists of Samuel Ha-Rophē the twelve Pericopes into which Genesis is divided exhibit thirty-nine variations between Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali. These I have duly given at the end of each Pericope. They are as follows: (1) 1 + (2) 2 + (3) 1 + (4) 4 + (5) 1 + (6) 7 + (7) 3 + (8) 7 + (9) 2 + (10) 4 + (11) 5 + (12) 2 = 39. In Pericope No. 8 which according to this Treatise has only seven variations, I have added an eighth in Gen. XXXVI 16:

ב"א אַלְּוֹף קרח, ב"נ אַלּוּף־קרח.

This variation is given in the Massoretico-Grammatical Treatise prefixed to the Yemen MSS. From this Treatise as well as from the splendid Madrid Codex No. 1, I have added in the Summary at the end of the first Pericope the instances in which Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali agree, which are omitted in the Massoretico-Grammatical Treatise.

¹ The Arabic List of variations between Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali which I printed in *the Massorah*, Vol. III, p. 6-14, is from this Liturgical Introduction.

² Comp. The Massorah, Vol. III, § 590b, p. 6-7. The vowel points attached to the Biblical words throughout this Treatise in my Massorah are those which are given in Samuel Ha-Rophe's MS.

³ Comp. The Massorah, Vol. III, § 590b, p. 6; with Derenbourg, Manuel du Lecleur, p. 111-115.

The importance of this addition may be seen from the fact that in the very first Pericope (Gen. I 1—VI 8) where these MSS. emphatically state that Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali agree in the punctuation of יהי אור let there be light (Gen. I 4) and אשר בראתי whom I have created (Gen. VI 7), Dr. Baer gives them in his List of differences between these two rival critics without mentioning that they are expressly excluded in some of the official Lists. 1

Exodus. — The eleven Pericopes into which Exodus is divided exhibit twenty variations. In this number both the List of Samuel Ha-Rophē and the List in the Massoretico-Grammatical Treatise agree. They are as follows: (1) 1 + (2) + (3) + (4) + (4) + (6) + (8) + (9) + (10) + (11) +

Leviticus. — In Leviticus which consists of ten Pericopes, Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali exhibit sixteen points of difference. Here too the number given by Samuel Ha-Rophē and in the Massoretico-Grammatical Treatise in the Yemen MSS. agree. The differences in the separate Pericopes are as follows: (1) 1 + (3) 1 + (4) 2 + (5) 1 + (6) 1 + (7) 1 + (8) 7 + (9) 2 = 16. In two Pericopes, viz. No. 2 (צ = Levit. VI 1—VIII 36) and No. 10 (צ = Levit. XXVI 3—XXVII 34) these two redactors of the text display no difference.

Numbers. — Numbers which is divided into ten Pericopes, exhibits twenty-four variations between Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali. They are as follows in the respective heb-

⁴ Comp. Genesis by Baer and Delitzsch, pp. 81, 82, Leipzig 1869.

² Comp. The Massorah, Vol. III, § 592b, p. 8-9; with Derenbourg, Manuel du Lecteur, p. 115-118.

³ Comp. The Massorah, Vol. III, § 594b, p. 9-10; with Derenbourg. Manuel du Lecteur, p. 118-120.

into eleven Pericopes there are nineteen differences between Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali. They are as follows according to the respective Pericopes: (2) 5 + (3) 4 + (4) 2 + (5) 2 + (6) 2 + (7) 1 + (8 and 9) 1 + (10) 2 = 19. Two Pericopes, viz. No. 1 (ברים) = Deut. I 1—III 22) and No. 11 (ברים) = Deut. XXXIII 1—XXXIV 12) are without any variation. The Treatise in the Yemen MS. emphatically states that there is also no variation in No. 7 (בי תבוא) = XXVI 1—XXIX 8) and therefore omits XXVI 19. It will, however, be seen that the Mukaddimat declares as emphatically that this Pericope exhibits one difference between Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali and that it carefully states in what the difference consists.²

Deuteronomy. - In Deuteronomy which is divided

Before passing over to the other two divisions of the Hebrew Bible, I exhibit in parallel columns the differences between Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali on Leviticus as they

¹ Comp. The Massorah, Vol. III, § 596b, p. 12-13; with Derenbourg, Manuel du Lecteur, p. 120-123.

² Comp. The Massorah, Vol. III, § 598b, p. 14; with Derenbourg, Manuel du Lecteur, p. 123-125.

Introduction.

are transmitted to us in the official Lists of seven MSS. and in the editio princeps of the Bible with the Massorah by Jacob b. Chayim 1524-25. By the side of these I give in the ninth column the readings in Orient. 4445 which

The Variations between Ben-Asher and Ben-

ls.	18	18	24	24	3	3	32	32	43	43	45	45	'n	3	31	31
Leviticus	IV	£	>	£	VI	£	XI	R	æ	£	2	£	XIII	E	£	2
	x U	μ̈́	ž U	ŭ	% ኒነ	у Ц	z U	μ	ŽĮ	ŭ	X U	ű	ž U	Ų	z U	Ÿ.
	וּמָן-רורם	ימן דרם	אשרושתא	X.	מָר מַרְ	נמטנם ר	יניל אשר ביני	ע"ע וְרֶל־אשׁר	נ"א אַל־תשקצו	'ζ.	המעלה	המעלה	עקיר־רינשר ב	עשורי	אָיָן־מראַרוּ	% :
Mukaddi- mat	o	0	Z Z	X D	o	٥	o	0	Ţ,	 X.	o	٥	o	0	<u> </u>	Ž.
Yemen MSS.	0	Ο.	Į X	ן איי	٥	o	o	o	o	0	o	٥	٥	o	1	G:_ - -
Or, 2201 A. D. 1246	ā	<u>ā</u> -	٥	0	ב מני מיי	֡֝֞֝֝֟֜֝֝֟֝֝֟֝֝֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֟֝֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓	ָּ יני	۲. ا	0	0	המעלה המעלה	המעלה המעלה	ון מי	HAL	0	c
M. L. P. Mo. 7 A. D. 1299	قِا	į.	0	o	מנטר	מְנְיִם בּ	4	ָמָל. פֿיַ	0	0			ו קר	נו נו	0	¢
Harley 1528	ā	į.	o	0	ימטט מיי	וְמְבְנִםוּ	t E	<u>,</u>	۰	0	דמעלה	המעלה	<u>u</u>	ו נו	۰	G
Add. 15250	<u>ā</u> -	į.	0	0	ומבנם ו	ומקנטיו	ł V	<u>ų</u>	۰	۰	רמעלה	רמעלה	1 1 1	i u	0	· · · · · ·
Editio My MS. Or. 4227	ā	<u>p</u> -	0	٥	ומכנסי ? וּמְבְנִסִּי	ומכנסי ין ומְבָנִםִּי	ż	<u>.</u>	0	o	המעלה המעלה המעלה	רמעלוי	٥	0	0	°
My MS.	á	į.	0	0			1	.	0	0	המעלה	המעלה המעלה	<u>ן</u> קי	ן ע-	•	o
Editio princeps	ā	<u>ā</u> .	٥	0	רמכנסר	ا الالالا الالالا	ž Ģ	Ž.	0	0	רמעלר		עשור	ן. ע-	С	•
Or. 4445	Į.		אַפֿר		במני פיי		ונל אשר	رةر. ا		* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *		<u>המעלר.</u>	**	תאר		<u>*</u>

S*

is the oldest MS. known at present, inasmuch as this will show the condition of the Hebrew text in the life-time of the two great redactors of the Bible as well as their respective relationship to the ancient text.

Naphtali in the official Lists of different MSS.

Nupn				- 5	,			3 0)	···	<i>D</i>							
48	48	26	26	51	51	23	23	56	26	m	3	20	20	21	21	CI	CI
£	E		e,	XIV	£	ΧX	£	E	£	XVIII	2	£	2	*	t	XIX	r.
z U	ų	% 1)	Ų	ጽ ህ	Ų	z U	ប៉ី	ž U	ņ	x U	ü	រុ	ņ	z U	Ϋ́ Ū	z U	ii ii
t. Bi	ושה	מורישת	<u>u</u> -	אנו-מן	Zr-uy	קל-המשכב	μ̈́	בֶּל־המשכנ	Ų. U∗	רכמינשר	ע'ג וְהַמֹּתְשׁוּר	אמירור מירור	אַמִּירָדְּ	מוראן	E LA	*パーコイーゼーロ	τ. χ. Π.
בשתי בלא פתה ובלא הלוף	0	<u>a-</u>	<u>p</u>	0	0	o	o	₹. U	ւ Ն Մո	ונמאשר	ומממשר	ממירון	to the	υ	U	o	٥
בשותי בלא פתח השוא	0	a:	c	0	0	o	O	Ļ			וומאשר	o	0	٥	o		₹.
ָ הַיַּ	נשה	<u>p</u> -	<u>a.</u>	Ļ Ā	Ļ	4,	ţ	C	O	v	J	מַמְ'תּוּ	يعربه	מוואל	נסורען	 X.	
i. Ur	יישרי.	<u>a</u> -	<u>a</u>	Ä	12-	i,	Ļ	0	0	Ų	o	שלירו	עמיה	מוראר	ומורעך ומורעך		
א' נישרי א'	ארושת	<u>a</u>	<u>p</u> -	1	7.1	ţ.	ţ	o	o	o	o	בן מרובי	ממ'רר	101 101 101 101 101 101 101 101 101 101	נמורעך	1,	ل ا
אי קשתי אי קשרי אינשתיי	אר־עשתי אר־עשתי	<u>a</u>	Ē-	AL.	7.7	₹,	۲. پر	٥	0	o	0	עמ'רור	עמיהר	מוראך	ומורער	۲- چر	.L.
אר נו ט תי	. ארבשתי	Ø.	ē	אני נין?	את מקי את־מק	ż,	44	0	0	0	0	ממ'תו	ממ'ירן	מורשן.	ומוראל	1,	i,
יי קי	rar.	ō.	ë.	xr-47	~~	₹.		0	0	U	c	מן. מירון	ממ'רוך	ומורעד	ומורשך ומורשך	1,	ال الايـ
ب ە ת'	וי עי	P-	į.	2	A	1 2,−	'n	0	o	0	0	ממ'תו	ממיתר	ימור ער מיר		'į.	
אָר נישָּרר אַר			Ū.	×1-44		על-המשכב		בְּלַ-המשכת		וְמַמְשָׁרִּ		ממירוך			מוראל	x4-24-	As a supervision

															-	
sno	XX IO	10	17	17	1 1	H	1 3	3	2	()	4	4	17	17	32	32
Leviticus	XX		£	t	XXI	£	XXII	£	XXIII	£	t	£	£	1	t	£
	11	ų	11	Ü	រា	Ų	Z U	11	11	Ų	11	Ü	X 11	il.	11	il il
Walter and the second s	מות-יומת	. a	ii Ii	· *-	בי מי	בינורנים	兵事が上てあれる	なまれー	אשררתקראו	Z A	אשררנקראו	Z.		ירים אירים	יאַ וורום יאַ וורום	שורוים שורוים
Mukaddimat	0	0	X uplar	Z.	ביורגים	u nere	i. Gir.	מְבֶּלְ-	Zi is	Z D	Z.	1 2	שתים בלא הלוף		שָׁנונינים	שנת בם י
Yemcn MSS.	C	O	*	c	0	*ゲードひにいつ	0	O	0	С	0	c	0	0	0	שורנם שורנם י
N. L. P. Or. 2201 No. 7 A. D. 1299 A. D. 1246	Ę.	ב מ	% -		0	0	0	o	0	0	0	0	שרים שרי	שָׁרִים	שָׁבְרַתְּיִם בְּיַבְּיִבְרָתִים	שַׁנונונם
N. L. P. No. 7 A. D. 1299	Ė Š	מור	X-	×η Υ	o	o	U	0	G	c	v	U	שרים פרים	ָם פרים	שנותנום	שנתנם י
Harley 1528	بر تا-	ני	% -	χ̈́¬	0	ú	0	o	0	o	o	Ü	שנים שני	שנים	שנונים	ישנת בם בי
Add. 15250	<u>ت</u> ت	מנר	% -	Z1	0	0	0	0	0	Ü	n	0	שרים ק	er B	שָׁנונום	שָׁנְתְּנִם שְׁנֵתְ
Orient. 4227	۲ ۵-	ซ ม	, %,	% -	0	o	o	0	u	o	o	٥	שרים אַ	שנים	שָׁנור בם שָׁנור בם	שַׁנְתְּנִם שַּׁנְתְנִים
My MS.	מיר	ָר. מ-	% 7	<u>z</u> -	0	0	0	0	0	٥	0	0	ם פרים פרים	שר'ם שר	שָׁרֵרְים שָּׁרֵרְים	שני ביי
Editio	ė-	į. Š	% -	X.	0	0	.0	o	0	¢.	o	0	שרים שרים	שנים	שתבנם	שָׁנְתְנְם בְּיַ
Orient, 4445		מית-יומת	r X		בי ב			מבליורעכם	אַשְרְרתקראַר		X.ユーロピーX		שנים ה		שנתנום	

		_,															
44	44	91.	91	9	9	^	7	37	37	42	43	52	52	90	ဘ	25	25
£		91 AIXX	£	XXV	æ	£	£	£	£	E	£	E	£	XXVII	ŧ	£	£
11	il U	ž U	ij	11	ų	11 %	ŭ	۲, آا	ŭ,	7 []	11	11	<u>'</u>	11	ii.	[] %	Ų
אָרַרמעָר.	Ę.	מנקרישָם	בנכלינ שָׁם	נו"א וריתר שבת	F.E.	ן לְבְּרִמְתְּךְ		אָתינוזמן	į.	HATE	f*	ואם-מעט ואם-מעט	ų X	אמרמף קמין	מורמן פתר	וְבֶּל־שַרכּך	ָרֶרְ בְּיִר
Ë	È.	מנכותנישם	בונקהרישָם	C	U	ולטרמהן	ולוהמהן	i.	Z-	Ų	0.	ן ן ן ן		בְּוֹךְ קמין יבלא הלוף	-	רבל- בלא ימיא יבלי בלא	2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2
Z.	Ļ	מניקה בשם	O	c	o	וַלְברמתר	o	С	E.	v	u	יאת- ילא הליפ יאת-	1	0	υ	ø	U
SC S	Z.C.	Œ	0	Ŀ Ŀ	E E	ילברמע ר	ָילְברִמּחִ <i>ך</i>	ŗ.	Ę.	ft-	fi.	<u>.</u> .	ii Ž	क्षा तथर	מון פרה	华	i.
%:	į.	U	o	E.E.	E.	ילבדמה	וְלְבֵרִמִּתַּךְ	Ę.	į. Š	P.	Pi-	ij	i Ni	की देवा	מון פניני	į.	1/2
Ľ.	į. K	v	n	i. L	E.	ולברמת	ולברמת	Ę.	Ľ.	Pi-	ļ).	ä	1 2 2	<u>r</u>	P	4	ئ الة
į.	Ę.	С	0	E.	E.	ולטרמה	ילברמתר וילברמתר וילברמתר וילברמתר	E.	į.	A:	Į.	i X	ü Z	\$	2	ţ.	₹. UE
» Kr	, XC	o	a	Ŀ Ŀ	EE	וַלְברמהן	ילבהמתך ולבהמתך	Z.	r. X	H-	P.	i Z	ង្ហ	क्षे देवर	מַן פּתוּ	ţ	t.
	Ľ.	· ·	0	,Ere	E	רלנורמה <u>ן</u>	ולברמהן	Ę.	Ę.	Pi.	Į.	200	ä Z	ָרָי מיּ	E.	$t_{\tilde{c}}$	۲.
Ę.	ŗ. Ā	0	0	E.	E	וְלְנהמתך	וְלְבִרִמִתְּךְ	Ľ.	į.	n.	P	ង្គ	<u> </u>	ţ.	<u>Qi</u>	٠. لا	بور ° ،
Ė.		בנקנו שִׁם		E.			וְלְתִדְמִתְּ	Ę.		f-		i Z		<u>\$</u> ;		וכל-ערכך	

From the above Table it will be seen that the official Lists often differ among themselves as to the precise nature of the variants even in the Pentateuch, where the greatest care has been taken to transmit the punctuation of Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali. The attempt, therefore, to reduce these variants into a system, to formulate rules from these conflictingly recorded differences and to apply these rules to other passages of the Hebrew Scriptures so as to multiply instances which are not contained in the official registers, is a task far more in harmony with the superfine ingenuity of some mediaeval grammarians than with sober textual criticism. It is probably due to this fact that the best Codices and even the MSS, which record the official Lists do not follow uniformly the punctuation of either Ben-Asher or Ben-Naphtali. Thus the oldest and most beautifully written Codex of the Pentateuch, viz. Orient. 4445 very rarely employs the Metheg or Gaya even before Chateph-pathach, and yet it is the presence or absence of the Metheg or Gaya which constitutes fully ninetenths of the differences between these two redactors of the text.

As regards the separate Treatise called in some MSS. Dikdukē Ha-Teamim which has come down to us in several Codices in the name of Ben-Asher, its text in the different MSS. and in the editio princeps is as hopelessly irreconcilable as that of the official Lists. The Treatise in question was first published in the editio princeps of the Rabbinic Bible by Felix Pratensis, Venice 1517, where it is described in the heading as the compilation of Ben-Asher. A second edition of it was published by Leopold Dukes under the title of Kontres Ha-Massoreth, Tübingen 1846, from a MS. in the possession of Luzzatto. In this MS., however, no author's name is given to the Treatise. These two editions, moreover, differ essentially in the text, and

the recension published by Dukes barely contains one fourth of the text in the editio princeps.

- (1) In my Massorah I published five other recensions of this Treatise. The first is under letter \mathfrak{V} , § 246, Vol. I, p. 654—660. This recension I printed from Add. 15251 British Museum where it forms an appendix with other Massoretic materials to the Hebrew text folio 444a-448a. It will be seen that the compilation is here ascribed to Ben-Asher. The arrangement and text of this recension approximate more closely to the *editio princeps* though the latter contains about thirty-five more Rubrics.
- (2) The second recension which I printed under letter \mathfrak{D} , § 44—75, in the third Volume of the Massorah, p. 41—43, is from the beautifully illuminated MS. Orient. 2626—28 where it occupies the first and second lines of the ornamental square in Vol. I, folio 1b-22b. Not only does the text of this recension differ materially from that of the other Treatises, but the Rubrics are fewer and are differently arranged. I could not, therefore, exhibit it in a parallel column with the other recensions.
- (3) The third recension which I have given in the third Volume of the Massorah is from Codex Tzufut-kale No. 15 for the transcript of which I am indebted to Professor Strack. The Epigraph which according to Strack proceeds from the clever hand of Firkowitsch, ascribes the Massorah to Aaron Ben-Asher. The Massorah itself consists of fifty-nine Rubrics of sundry Massoretic import and constitutes an Appendix to an ancient and valuable fragment of the Pentateuch. Of these only twenty-two correspond to recension No. 1, whilst nine are to be found in the additions in the compilation of Drs. Baer and Strack.

¹ Comp. Baer and Strack, Dikdukė Ha-Teamim, Einleitung, p. XXXIII, Leipzig 1879; with The Massorah, Vol. III, p. 295.

(4) The fourth recension which I also printed in the third Volume of the Massorah¹ is from Codex Tzufutkale No. 17 for a transcript of which I am indebted to Professor Strack. The Codex to which the Massorah in question forms an Appendix, contains an imperfect Pentateuch of 213 folios and is one of the most important fragments of the Hebrew Scriptures.

The Epigraph which assigns the date A. D. 790 to this MS. making it to belong to the grand-father of Aaron b. Moses Ben-Asher, has manifestly been tampered with and the Shin (= 300) according to the statement of Professor Strack has been made out of the original Tav ($\dot{n} = 400$). But though no reliance whatever can be placed on the date, still the MS. is very important.2 The Rubrics which form the separate Treatise called Dikdukē Ha-Teamim are not grouped together in this MS. as a distinct whole. They simply constitute sundry parts of a somewhat extensive Massorah. As will be seen in my reproduction of it, the Massorah itself contains ninety-six Rubrics of diverse Massoretic import. The portions which correspond to the Rubrics in the Dikduke Ha-Teamim in No. 1 are only nineteen and eleven correspond to the additions in the compilation of Drs. Baer and Strack.

To exhibit in parallel columns the relationship of the parts in this Massorah which correspond to the Rubrics contained in the $Dikduk\bar{e}$ Ha-Teamim I have numbered them according to the order in which they occur.

(5) The fifth recension which I have given in the third Volume of the Massorah, is the Massorah Finalis in Codex Tzufutkale No. 19 for the transcript of which I am

¹ Comp. The Massorah, Vol. III, § 1-96, p. 269-294.

² Comp. Baer and Strack, Dikduke Ha-Teamin, Einleitung, p. XXXIV, Leipzig 1879; with The Massorah, Vol. III, p. 294 where the Epigraph is given.

likewise indebted to Professor Strack. The Massorah which is incomplete consists of thirty-six Rubrics. Of these, fifteen correspond to recension No. 1 and four to the additions in the compilation of Drs. Baer and Strack.

Through the kindness of Professor Chwolson I have received a copy of this Treatise made from the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 1009, which I give in extenso in the Appendix. This exhibits the oldest homogeneous form of the compilation in question. And as the MS. is a copy of the Ben-Asher Codex made only about three or four years after the Codex itself was conveyed from Jerusalem to Cairo,2 it must finally decide the form and contents of the Treatise. On comparing the Appendix it will be seen that the Treatise consists of only forty-two Rubrics instead of seventy-six as given in the Dikduke Ha-Teamim of Drs. Baer and Strack and that they follow quite a different order. To give the student a proper idea of the import of this valuable Treatise, I have made it the basis of comparison with the other recensions. It, therefore, occupies the first column in the Table.

-	l	ab	le	4	l.
				_	_

Tzufut. No. 19	Tzufut. No. 17	Tzufut. No. 15	Orient. 15251	Editio princeps	B. S.	MS. A.D.1009	
0	0	0	0	0	0	§ I	ברוך יהוה אלהים אלהי ישראל
0	0	§ 21	§ 3	§ 3	§ 3 a	§ 2 a	סדר המקרא תורה האשמרת
n	0	§ 22	§ 4	§ 4	§ 3 b	§ 2 b	סדר הנביאים
0	0	§ 23	§ 5	§ 5	§ 3 c	§ 2 c	סדר הכתובים
0	0	§ 2	٥	0	§ 2	§ 3	יהי שם יהוה מברך
0	•	§§3,4	•	0	§ 4	§ 4	עור בשלשה תורה נמשלה
0	§ 55	§ 5	0	0	§ 9	§ 5	סדר סוד התורה
0	§ 41	§ 17	٥	0	§ 10	§ 6	שבע נקרות. למאר כברות

¹ Comp. Baer and Strack, Dikdukē Ha-Teamim, Einleitung, p. XXXV, Leipzig 1879; with The Massorah, Vol. III, p. 310—326.

² Vide supra, pp. 243, 244.

Tzufut. No 19	Tzufut, No. 17	Tzufut. No. 15	Orient.	Editio princeps	B. S.	MS. A.D.1009	
T	EZ	βZ	0 1	H ir		Y	
0	§ 57	§ 6	§ 2	§ 2	 § 17	§ 7	שער המעמים שנים עשר רשומים
0	§ 58	§ 8	0		§ 5a	§ 8	אילו תולדות האותיות
0	§ 59	§ 8			§ 5 <i>b</i>	§ 9	אילו תולדות האותיות
0	§ 60	0	0		§ 15a		סדר הנקדות והטעמים
0	§ 61	c	0	0	§ 15b	§ 11	סדר בשוי המקרא
c	§ 62	0	0	0	§ 36a	1	עשר נקדות אומץ המקרא
0	§ 37	۰	0	o	§ 36b	§ 13	שער צירוף הרום
§ 27	§ 35	0	0	0	§ 11	§ 14	סדר שוא המשרת לכל האותיות
§ 28	0	§ 19	§ 21	§ 28	§ 55	§ 15	סדר התיכות כדגש ורפי
§ 29	§§ 34, 43	§ 9	§ 26	0	§ 29	§ 16	םימן אֹהֹוֹי אשר מראש קנויה
0	0	§ 10	§ 6	§ 6	§ 19	§ 17	םימן שילשלה ומארכה
0	0	§ 11	§ 8	§ 8	§ 20	§ 18	םימן תברה ומארכה
§ 19	§ 33	§ 12	§ 9	§ 9	\$ 33	§ 19	סימן שתי אתות אשר בתיבה אחת
0	§ 90	§ 15	§ 13	§ 13	§ 21	§ 20	דרך אולה. העולה היא למעלה
§ 20	§ 3 9	§ 13	0	§ 14	§ 53	§ 2 I	סימן לשון ברכה
0	o	§ 14	0	0	§ 18	§ 22	שער מעמים שמונה
0	٥	0	§ 14	§ 15	§ 24	§ 23	סימן שלשת הספרים
0	0	0	§ 15	§ 16	§ 25	§ 24	. סימן סוף הפסוקים
0	٥	0	§ 16	§ 17	§ 26	§ 25	סימן לראשי הפסוקים
٥	n	0	§ 17	§ 17b	§ 27	§ 26	סימן גרש ופתח בשלשה ספרים
§ 31	§ 36	0	٥	0	§ 37	§ 27	סימן סמוך ומוכרת במקרא
§ 32	0	0	۰	0	§ 39	§ 28	םימן ממוך ומוכרת בשתי נקודות
§ 35	0	0	§ 10	§ 10	§ 41	§ 29	םימן בֶּן ובֵן
§ 34	0	0	§ 1 1	§ 11	§ 42	§ 30	סימן אֶת ואֵת
§ 33	0	0	۰	0	§ 40	§ 31	םימן שלש נקודות ושתי נקודות
0	0	0	0	0	§ 56	§ 32	סימן למה ולמה רפי ודגש
0	0	0	0	§ 14	§ 51	§ 33	כל לשון אכילה
§ 21	§ 51	0	0	§ 14	§ 50	§ 34	כל לשון הליכה
§ 26	0	0	0	§ 14	§ 35	§ 35	כל לשון עשיה
٥	٥	۰	۰	§ 14	§ 45	§ 36	כל לשון חרבות
§ 25	٥	§ 20	0	0	1	§ 37	כל לשון מרכבה
0	0	0	§ 12	§ 12		§ 38	םימן כָּל וכֹל
0	0	۰	\$ 19	§ 19	1	§ 39	דרך הגיעיה בכל המקרא
0	0	0	0	0	-	§ 40	סימן ריש אשר יצא כדנש
§ 22	§ 88	§ 44	•	٥		§ 41	כל ויהיו ויירשו גיעיה ביוד
§ 23	§ 89	§ 56	0	٥	§ 12	§ 42	כל יוד רסמיך ליה שוא

Table II. Additions in the Compilation of Drs. Baer and Strack.

1; 6	۷ ند	.: 10	1 .:	Si	6		
Tzufut. No. 19	Tzufut. No. 17	Tzufut. No. 15	Orient.	Editio	MS. A.D.1009	B. S.	
H Z	HZ	HZ	0 -	<u>" </u>	<		
0	0	§ 1	§ 1	§ ı	0	§ 1	זה ספר מדקדוקי הטעמים
0	0	o	•	0	0	§ 6	דרך אחה"ע ארבע אותיות
0	0	§ 24	6	c	0	§ 8	סדר סוד התיבות אשר במקרא
0	o	0	0	0	n	§ 13	כל תיבה שבמקרא כמו לישראל
0	0	0	§§ 23,24	§§ 30,31	0	§ 14	יש סופרים דברי אמת מורים
0	§ 40	§§ 16,18		§ 25	0	§ 16	שנים עשר שמות המעמים
0	О	0	0	0	0	§ 22	שני מאריכין למפחה
e e	0	0	0	0	0	§ 23	סימן אזלה או שופר לפשטה
0	0	0	§ 20	§§ 20,23	0	§ 28	ביאור הפסק
0	0	0	0	0	0	§ 32	כל לשון יראה געיה
0	§ 44	0	§ 18	§ 18	0	§ 34	כל הקריה המדברים וגו'
0	0	0	0	0	0	§ 38	כל מלה סמוכה. בפתח ערוכה
۰	0	0	§ 22	§ 29	0	§ 43	סימן הֵם והֶם
0	0	0	o	0	٥	§ 46	כל צפריא דרניאל
0	0	0	0	0	0	§ 48	סימן בכ"ל על חי"ת
0	0	0	c	0	0	§ 49	סימן פתח בשער פעל
۰	С	0	0	0	0	§ 52	סימן לשון גרישה
0	o	0	0	0	0	§ 54	כל קריה ויאסר דגש
0	o	0	0	0	n	§ 57	י״ח מלין כנויי סופרים
0	0	0	0	§ 41	0	§ 58	חמש עשרה נקורות
0	0	0	0	0	0	§ 59	אלו אותיות תלויות
c	0	с	0	§ 35	0	§ 60	ואלו אותיות מנוזרות
0	§ 52	0	0	0	0	§ 61a	אלו אותיות גדולות
0	§ 53	0	0	0	0	§ 61 <i>b</i>	ואלו אותיות קטנות
0	0	0	0	§ 42	0	§ 62a	י׳ מִלין דקריין ולָא כתיבן
0	0	O	0	§ 43	0	§ 62b	וחלופיהון ח' מלין דכתבן ולא קריין
0	٥	0	0	0	0	§ 63	סדר קרי ולא כתיב
§ 29	0	0	0	0	0	§ 64	וזה פירוש כתיב ולא קרי
							וזה הוא פירוש סתרי המקרא בחסיר
§ 30	0	0		0	0	§ 65	וביתיר
۰	0	۰	0	0	0	§ 66	בי״ה שמ״ו סימן
٥	0	0	0	۰	0	§ 67	הפסקות בתורה
§ 18	§ 11	\$ 37	0	0	0	§ 68	סכום הפסוקים

	B. S.	MS. A.D.1009	Editio princeps	Orient. 15251	Tzufut. No. 15	Tzufut. No. 17	Tzufut. No. 19
הדא מסורתא דמסד דוסא	§ 69	0	§§ 50, 51	0	0	С	0
מספר השנים של הספרים	§ 70	0	\$\$ 48, 61	0	§ 38	§ 12	§ 36
םדר קמצות	§ 71	o	0	0	c	o	0
סימן קמצין ופתחין בקריה	§ 72	0	0	0	0	0	
הלין לית כות' בקריה מלעיל	§ 73a	0	§ 24	0	§ 59	§ 94	0
וחלופיהון מלרע	§ 73b	0	§ 25	0	ю	§ 95	0
םימן אֶל	§ 74a	0	n	0	§ 45	§ 93	0
וחלופיהון עַל	§ 74b	0	0	0	0	§ 93	0
סמן כל קריאה שבת שבתון ונו׳	§ 75	0	0	0	§ 43	§ 25	0
סמן כל קריאה דגן ותירש וגו'	§ 76	0	0	0	§ 42	0	0

Table III. From the Editio princeps.

Tzufut. No. 19	Tzufut. No. 17	Tzufut. No. 15	Add. 15251	Editio princeps	MS. A D.1009	В. S.	
0	0	0	0	§ 26	0	0	א"ב מן ב"ב חר רלת וחר ריש
o	0	٥	٥	§ 27	0	0	א"ב מן חד חד חד כת' כ וחד כת" ב
0	0	c	c	§ 32	o	٥.	תיבה חד וקורין תרן
U	v	o	0	§ 33	n	o	חילוף כתי' תרין וקורין חד
							א"ב מן חד חד כתי' יו"ד באמ' תיב'
0	0	0	0	§ 36	0	0	וק׳ וא״ו
			1				וחלופי א"ב מן חד חד כתי ו' באמי
C	0	0	0	§ 37	С	c	תיב׳ וק׳ י׳
0	0	С	0	§ 38	0	0	ם"ג מלין מוקדם מאוחר
							ה' זוגין מן ב' ב' חר כת' ה' בסו' תיב'
0	0	٦	0	§ 3 9	0	0	וחד כת' י'
							ייב זוגין מן בי בי חד כתי א' בסרי
0	٥	0	0	§ 40	o'		תיב' וחד כת' ה'
0	٥	0	0	\$ 44	0	o	ש"ו דכת' מלה חדא וקו' תרין
0	0	0	0	§ 45		0	ני מלין תיב' קדמ' נסב תנינ'
0	0	0	0	§ 46	٥	o	וחילופי בי מְלין תניני נִסב מן קדמי
0	0	0	0	§ 47	0	0	ם"ו דכתי' לא וקרין לו
0	٥		0	§ 49	0	o	פסקא דספרא אלה הדברים
0	٥	. 0	0	§ 52	0	0	פלונתי בן אשר ובן נפתלי בראשית
0	0	0	0	§ 53	0	0	" " שמות " "
0	٥	0	0	§ 54	0	0	" " ויקרא " "

Tzufut. No. 19	Tzufut. No. 17	Tzufut. No. 15	Add. 15251	Editio princeps	MS. A.D.1009	B. S.				
0	0	0	0	§ 55	0	0	במדבר	וכן נפתלי	בן אשר	פלוגת׳
c	0	0	0	§ 56	o	0	רות	,,	'n	-
0	0	0	0	§ 57	0	0	שיר השירים	••	*1	,,
0	0	0	0	§ 58	c	0	קהלת		,,	,,
0	o ,	0	0	§ 59	0		קנות	,,	,,	ņ
0	0	0	e	§ 60	0	o	מגלה	••	,,	,,
	С	0	0	§ 61	0	0	[דברים]	,,	,	-

The above Tables disclose the following facts:

- (1) With the exception of the Treatise in the St. Petersburg MS. of A. D. 1009, which occupies the first column, in Add. 15251, which occupies the fourth column and *editio* princeps in the third column, none of the Rubrics exhibited in the other four columns follow any explicable order.
- (2) The Rubrics in question are simply so many divers parts of different Massorahs of the *Dikdukē Ha-Teamim* exhibited in column two, which Drs. Baer and Strack have arbitrarily taken out from sundry MSS. and different positions to fall in with their preconceived notions of an independent Treatise.
- (3) Even now no two corresponding Rubrics absolutely agree in their wording of the theme discussed therein, and words and whole phrases have often to be taken from one recension and inserted into the other.
- (4) The ascription on the part of the editors of the conglomerate Treatise exhibited in the second column to Ben-Asher is unjustifiable.
- (5) The Rubrics therein represent portions of the Massorah which have been gradually developed from a period much earlier than Ben-Asher to a time much later than this textual critic.
- (6) Many of the Rubrics exhibit various opinions about the vowel-points and accents propounded by different

Massoretic Schools before the vowel-points and accents assumed their present definite forms.

- (7) As far as my collation of the numerous MSS. goes I can safely state that I have not found a single MS. which uniformly follows the rules about the vowel-points and accents propounded in the name of Ben-Asher in the Treatise which Drs. Baer and Strack have compiled and have named "The Dikduke Ha-Teamim of Ben-Asher".
- (8) If, therefore, Codices which in their Massoretic Appendices exhibit Rubrics ascribed to Ben-Asher, do not follow his rules in the text, it shows that either the rules do not belong to Ben-Asher or that they were not generally accepted and that the opinions of other Massoretic Schools were more popular. And
- (9) It is most uncritical to correct the definite statements in the official Lists which tabulate the precise nature of the differences between Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali by the uncertain utterances in these highly artificial Rubrics. The reverse process is far more critical. Any views expressed in the conglomerate Treatise which do not harmonise with the official Lists must not be taken as proceeding from Ben-Asher.

Chap. XI.

The Massorah; its Rise and Development.

The labours of the Massorites may be regarded as a later development and continuation of the earlier work which was carried on by the Sopherim (סופרים, γοαμματεῖς) = the doctors and authorised interpretors of the Law soon after the return of the Jews from the Babylonish captivity (comp. Ezra VII 6; Neh. VIII 1 &c.). And though it is now impossible to describe in chronological order the precise work which these custodians of Holy Writ undertook in the new Commonwealth, it may safely be stated that the gradual substitution of the square characters for the so-called Phoenician or archaic Hebrew alphabet was one of the first tasks.

I. The introduction of the square characters. That the Old Testament was originally written in the characters which with some slight modifications have been retained by the Samaritans as exhibited on the Nablus Stone is admitted in the Talmud. Nothing can be more plain than the declaration of the highest Talmudic authorities that the present square characters are an innovation and that the Old Testament was originally written in the Raatz, Libonaah or what is now called the Samaritan alphabet.

Thus the distinguished R. Nathan, who was in the College of R. Jehudah I (A. D. 140—163), and who compiled

¹ Comp. Rosen, Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft XIV, 622 &c.. Leipzig 1860.

a collection of Halachoth known by the name of the Mishna or Tosephta of R. Nathan, declares "the Law was originally given in *Raatz* characters" with which his colleague R. Jose agreed. Again Mar Ukba, the celebrated chief judge during the Patriarchate of R. Jehudah II A. D. 220—270 says:

"At first the Thora was given to Israel in Hebrew characters and in the sacred language, but in the time of Ezra they obtained it in the Assyrian [= square] characters and in the Aramaic language. At last the sages chose the Assyrian [= square] characters and the sacred language for the Israelites and left the Hebrew characters and the Aramaic language for the idiots. Now who are the idiots? R. Chasda says the Samaritans. What characters are the Hebrew? R. Chasda says the Libonaah characters." 2

In accordance with these declarations we are told that the present square characters "are called Assyrian because the Jews brought them with them from Assyria".

To invest it with authority this innovation, like many other changes, was ascribed to Ezra himself.

Thus R. Jose says Ezra was worthy that the Law should be given to Israel through his hand, were it not that Moses preceded him. For of Moses it is said: 'And Moses went up unto God' [Exod. XIX 3] and of Ezra it is said 'this Ezra went up from Babylon' [Ezra VII 6] Now as the expression 'went up' is used in the one case with reference to the giving of the Law, so it is in the other. Of Moses it is said 'and the Lord commanded me at that time, to teach you statutes and judgments' [Deut. IV 14], and of Ezra it is said 'for Ezra had prepared his heart to seek the Law of the Lord and

Jerusalem Megilla I, 9; Babylon Sanhedrin 22a.

יוםה יוםה ואתייא כר' יוםה ויינה אומר ברעץ ניתנה התורה ואתייא כר' יוםה וניתנה לישראל בכתב עברי ולשון הקודש חזרה וניתנה להם בתב עברי ולשון הקודש חזרה וניתנה להם בימי עזרא בכתב אשורית ולשון ארמי בירו להן לישראל כתב אשורית ולשון הקודש בימי עזרא בהרי ולשון ארמי מאן הריוטות אמר רב חסרא כתב ליבונאה: בהיחו ולשון ארמי בירו אמר רב חסרא כתב ליבונאה: "ולמה נקרא שמו אשורית ... אמר רבי לוי על שם שעלה בירם מאשור:

to do it, and to teach Israel statutes and judgments' [Ezra VII 10]. But though the Law was not given by him the writing was changed by him,1

Hence both Origen and St. Jerome who derived their information from their Jewish teachers, record the same thing. The former states: "They say that Ezra used other letters after the exile",2 whilst the latter declares: "It is certain that Ezra the Scribe and teacher of the Law after Jerusalem was taken and the temple was restored under Zerubbabel, found other letters which we now use; since up to that time the characters of the Samaritans and of the Hebrews were the same".3

That the original characters of the Law should have been changed, and that the hated Samaritans should still be in possession of the sacred alphabet was, however, more than some of the patriotic Rabbins could endure. Hence we find R. Eliezer of Modin maintaining that the Law was given to Moses from the first in the Assyrian or the present square characters. He adduces as an argument for his declaration that in the square character alone can the name Vav for the sixth letter, denoting hook in Exod. XXVI to be justified, since it is only in the square character that the import of the name corresponds to the form of the letter, whilst there is no such correspondence in the

י תניא ר' יוםי אומר ראוי היה עזרא שתינתן תורה על ידו לישראל אילמלא לא קרמו משה, במשה הוא אומר ומשה עלה אל האלהים, בעורא הוא אומר הוא עזרא עלה מבבל, מה עלייה האמור כאן תורה, אף עלייה האמור להלן תורה, במשה הוא אומר בעות בוה בעת ההוא ללמד אתכם חקים ומשפטים, בעזרא הוא אומר כי עורא הבין לבכו לדרוש את תורת יהוה אלהיו ולעשות וללמד בישראל חוק ומשפט. ידו הכתבה על ידו נשתנה על ידו Babylon Sanhedrin 21 b; with Jerusalem Megilla I 9.

² φασί γὰς τον Εσδραν έτέροις χρήσασθαι μετὰ τὴν αλημαλωσίαν Monfaucon, Hexapla II 94.

³ Certumque est Esdram scribam legisque doctorem, post capta Hierosolyma et instaurationem templi sub Zorobabel, alias litteras repperisse, quibus nunc utimur, cum ad illud usque tempus iidem Samaritanorum et Hebraeorum characteres fuerint. Prolg. Galeat. ad lib. Regum.

Samaritan.¹ But as even some of the most zealous sages, who regarded this question from a dogmatical point of view, saw this opinion was contrary to the then ascertained facts they tried to harmonise both statements. Hence R. Jehudah I says: "The Thora was at first given to Israel in square characters, but when they sinned, the characters were changed into Raatz [= Samaritan], and when they repented in the days of Ezra the square characters were again restored to them as it is written: turn you to the strong-hold ye prisoners of hope, even to day will I restore to you the forgotten characters of the Mishna = the Law" (Zech. IX 12).² In accordance therewith R. Jehudah I and those Rabbins who deny that the square characters are Assyrian take מורי to be an appellative and make it denote the happy, the blissful, erect or beautiful characters.

The fact that the old Hebrew characters were still current B. C. 139—40, that the Mishna and the Talmud find such frequent occasion to forbid their use for ritual writings,³ that many of the mistakes in the Hebrew text itself, and that some of the variations between it and the Septuagint are distinctly traceable to a confusion of the letters which are similar in shape not only in the square characters, but in the old Hebrew = Phoenician, Palmyrene &c., shows most conclusively that all those alphabets which are simply tachygraphical and caligraphical variations of the same characters were simultaneously used and that the final conquest of the present letters over the rival alphabets was achieved slowly.

ים שמעון בן אלעזר אמר משום רבי אלעזר בן פרטא שאמר משום רבי ותני רבי שמעון בן אלעזר אמר מחורה, ומה טעמא ווי העמודים שיהו ווים של תורה לעזר המודעי כתב אשורי ניתנה התורה, ומה טעמא ווי העמודים דומים לעמודים:

1 אומר אשורית ניתנה התורה ובשחטאו נהפך להן לרעץ ובשוכו בימי עזרא בימי אומר אשיב לך:

2 אשיב לקן אשורית נם היום מניד משנה אשיב לך:

3 Jerusalem Megilla I 9; Babylon Sanhedrin 22a.

³ Comp. Megilla I 8: 11 1, 2; Yadaim IV 5.

Judging from the mistakes which are to be found in the Hebrew MSS. produced by skilful and professional copyists during the middle ages despite the minute Massoretic directions, it is perfectly certain that the guild of Sopherim who were thus engaged in the delicate task of transcribing the text from the ancient alphabet into the square characters committed similar mistakes, especially when they had before them a script in which some of the letters resembled each other. It is therefore only natural to find that some of the errors in the present Hebrew text are due to the transcription. They may be rectified by going back to the old Hebrew characters where some letters are similar though they are dissimilar in the square alphabet. A few illustrations must suffice to establish this fact.

(1) The similarity of N = N and N = N.

That these two letters were not unfrequently mistaken because of their resemblance to each other is evident from the Septuagint transliteration of proper names. Thus the name אצבן Ezbon in Gen. XLVI 16, is $\Theta\alpha\sigma\sigma\beta\alpha\nu = 0$ in the Septuagint. There can be no doubt about it since the Tav (ת) is expressed in the Septuagint by ϑ as is evident from this very chapter where תקר Kehath in verse 11, is transliterated $K\alpha\alpha\vartheta$, אסנת Asenath in verse 20 is Asenèt, and Naphtali in verse 23 is $N\varepsilon\varphi\vartheta\alpha\lambda i$.

ו Sam. XXIV 10. The error here is due to the same cause. The text as it now stands is מליך and, or but she spared thee. As this yields no sense, both the Authorised Version and the Revised Version, following the example of the Vulgate, insert mine eye in italics. This, however, is contrary to the uniform usage of the verb. Besides the passage in question, or not pity, to have compassion, which is only used in the Kal, occurs twenty-three times. In eight instances it expresses the direct action of the person, viz.

I, thou or he, spared or pitied, whilst in fifteen instances it describes the sparing or pitying of the eye. Now in the passages where do not to pity, is the predicate of the eye, the eye is invariably expressed. To supply it in this solitary passage is, therefore, contrary to the uniform usage. Hence there can hardly be any doubt that originally the text was do not not not not like the present reading is due to an exchange of Aleph (N) and Tav (N). When it is borne in mind that the Septuagint, the Chaldee and the Syriac have actually the reading with Aleph, the mistake will not be questioned. In accordance with my principle not to introduce any alteration into the Massoretic text, I have retained do not not margin.

Jerem. III 8 is another instance of a mistake arising from the same source. The verse now stands in the Authorised Version as follows:

And I saw, when for all the causes whereby backsliding Israel committed adultery I had put her away, and given her a bill of divorce; yet her treacherous sister Judah feared not, but went and played the harlot also.

This is hardly intelligible. The prophet describes and contrasts the conduct of the two sisters Israel and Judah towards God, to whom they were both espoused. Israel had first gone astray and had been divorced for her unfaithfulness. But in spite of her guilt God was willing to forgive her and take her back if she would return. She refused, and as a punishment she was discarded. Now Judah who saw the treacherous conduct and the terrible sufferings of her sister, instead of taking warning thereby, defied all fear and acted in the same incontinent

Comp. Jerem. XIII 14; XXI 7; Ezek. XXIV 14; Joel II 17; Jonah IV
 10, 11; Ps. LXXII 13; Neb. XIII 22.

² Comp. Gen. XLV 20; Deut. VII 16; XIII 9; XIX 13, 21; XXV 12; Isa. XIII 18; Ezek. V 11; VII 4, 9; VIII 18; IX 5, 10; XVI 5; XX 17.

manner. Hence because she saw that the terrible sufferings of her sister were inflicted upon her by her offended God for her wickedness and yet in the face of all this acted in the same faithless and shameless manner, Judah is denounced as worse than her sister Israel, who had gone astray before her, and had, therefore, no such fearful example and warning (comp. Jerem. III 11). Thus it is Judah's seeing her sister's conduct and punishment and not taking warning by them, which aggravated her guilt and it is upon her seeing all this that the stress is laid. To introduce God, therefore, as a new subject and to make Him say "and I saw" &c. is to mar the whole connection and flow of the passage. All this is obviated by restoring the Tav (ח) for the Aleph (א). It at once becomes plain that ותרא and she saw, is the protasis and וחלך and she went, is the apodosis. Accordingly the passage ought to be rendered:

Though she saw that for this very cause that backsliding Israel had committed adultery I had put her away and given her a bill of divorce, and treacherous Judah her sister feared not yet she went and she also played the harlot.

The Vulgate is the only version which exhibits this sense and the Revised Version exhibits it in the margin.

Ezra VI 4 exhibits a reverse instance, inasmuch as the Aleph (N) has here been mistaken for Tav (N). According to the present text we are told that Cyrus commanded the Temple to be built

with three rows of great stones and a row of new timber thus implying that otherwise the builders would use old timber. To say nothing of the want of dignity implied in such a decree, any one looking at the construction of the two clauses of this passage in the original will see that the Aleph has here been mistaken for Tav and that the sentence is:

294

נדבכין די אבן גלל תלתא ונדבך די אע חדא

rows of great stones three and row of timber one.

The Septuagint has preserved the original reading and the Revised Version exhibits it in the margin.

(2) The similarity of $\mathfrak{A} = \mathfrak{I}$ and $\mathfrak{A} = \mathfrak{I}$ accounts for another class of errors.

Exod. XIV 2, 9. It is owing to this cause that the proper name החירה Hachiroth, which occurs three times, is twice rendered in the Septuagint by $\tilde{\epsilon}\pi\alpha\nu\lambda\nu = \pi$ the village (Exod. XIV 2, 9), taking the Yod for Tzadi. This is evident from the fact that $\tilde{\epsilon}\pi\alpha\nu\lambda\nu$ not only is the Septuagint equivalent for החצרה in Exod. VIII 9, but is the translation of חצר in no fewer than nineteen passages.

In Isa. XI וז we have the phrase בעים רוחו which by simple conjecture is usually translated with his mighty wind. But the word עים does not occur in the Hebrew or in the cognate languages. It is now generally admitted that as the Yod and Tzadi are alike in the ancient Hebrew, the text originally had

(3) The similarity of $\beta = 3$ and $\lambda = 5$.

Ezek. XXII 20. In accordance with the present Hebrew text, this passage is rendered both in the Authorised Version and in the Revised Version:

As they gather silver, and brass, and iron, and lead, and tin, into the midst of the furnace, to blow the fire upon it, to melt it: so will I gather you in mine anger and in my fury and I will leave you there, and melt you

It will be seen that in the first part of the verse three verbs are used, viz. gather, blow and melt (קבץ, נפה, נתך), and it is, therefore, only natural to expect, that the same

¹ Comp. Levit. XXV 31; Josh. XIII 23, 28; XV 44, 47; XIX 8, 38, 39; Isa. XLII 11; LXII 9; Neh. XI 25, 30; XII 29; I Chron. IV 32, 33; VI 41; IX 22; 25.

three verbs will be repeated in the second part of the comparison. Instead of this only two are repeated, viz. gather (קביק) the first and melt (קביק) the third, whilst for the second to blow (מפוד) we have the tame expression leave you or lay you as the Revised Version has it, which mars the rhythm and parallelism. It is, therefore, certain that the original Pe was mistaken for Nun and that הנוחתי and I mill leave, should be המוחתי and I mill blow. This is, moreover, corroborated by the next verse, where the statement is repeated and where the three verbs in question are properly given. So glaringly does this mistake disturb the evenness of the passage that Houbigant, without knowing the cause of the error, actually adopts the reading and I mill blow, and Bishop Newcome in his translation of Ezekiel renders it:

So will I gather you in mine anger, and in my fury, and I will blow upon you and melt you.

These few instances must suffice to indicate the great advantages which may accrue to Biblical criticism by a careful re-transcription of some of the difficult passages in the present square characters into the archaic script. Hassencamp and Luzzatto 1 have shown the way in this direction, but as yet few have followed it. The question, however, about the development of the present square characters from the earlier Phoenician and their introduction into the Hebrew Bible, has been most ably discussed by scholars both at home and abroad. The Treatises on this points, which are most accessible to students will be found in the foot-note.²

¹ Comp. Hassencamp, Commentatio Philologico-Critica de Pentateucho LXX &c., p. 57 &c., Marburg 1765; Luzzatto, in Kirchheim's Karme Shomron, p. 106 &c.

² Comp. Gesenius, Geschichte der hebräischen Sprache und Schrift, p. 137 &c., Leipzig 1815; Herzfeld, Geschichte des Volkes Israel, Vol. II,

The probable period during which this change was effected may be ascertained from the fact that the Samaritan Pentateuch which the Samaritans received from the Jews circa 430 B. C. was still written in Phoenician characters and that these characters were in use when Simon struck the first Jewish coins in 141 B. C. As some of the variations in the Septuagint are undoubtedly due to the similarity of the letters in the Phoenician, and others are traceable to the square characters, the struggle for the victory between these two scripts must have continued for several centuries. It was not till the time of our Lord that the Aramaic characters finally prevailed over the ancient alphabets. This is evident from St. Matth. V 18 where the letter Yod (*) is described as the smallest in the alphabet, since this is inapplicable to the old Hebrew.

II. The division of the consonants into words. — Having transliterated the text, the next function of the official redactors would naturally be the division of the consonants into separate words in accordance with the sense traditionally assigned to the respective documents. Like the work of transliteration, the process of the word-division was a gradual one and probably extended over several centuries after the Babylonish captivity. From this part of the Sopheric labours we definitely learn that the doctors of the Law who were periodically engaged in this task had different traditions about the meaning of certain passages and hence divided some words differently. This fact is revealed to us in the Massorah itself which has transmitted to us two or four Lists of words divided differently according to the School of Massorites whence

p. 76 &c.; Graetz, Geschichte der Juden II 11, p. 400 etc., Leipzig 1876; Driver, Notes on the Hebren text of the Books of Samuel, p. IX &c., Oxford 1890; Neubauer, The Introduction of the square characters in Biblical MSS. &c. in the Studia Biblica et Ecclesistica, p. 1 &c., Oxford 1891.

they proceed. These Lists, however, contain only typical examples and there is no doubt that there were many more such instances.

Incidentally we learn that I Kings XX 33 exhibits another instance about the division of which the different Schools of Massorites held different opinions. In this case we are distinctly told that the Western redactors divided the words in question one way, whilst the Easterns divided them differently. And though the records of other Schools have not come down to us, we know that the redaction of the Hebrew text from which the Septuagint translation was made exhibited a large number of passages in which the words were otherwise divided. This shows that about 200 B. C. the School from which the present word-division proceeds had not as yet established its authority over the rival Schools of textual critics.

III. The introduction of the Final Letters. — As a consequence of their anxiety to indicate more definitely the separation of some words and especially biliteral particles which were more liable to be read together with other vocables, the Sopherim introduced the double or five final letters. The gradual development of these letters we learn from a somewhat obscure anecdote in the Jerusalem Talmud which is as follows:

Now as to the double letters in the alphabet the copyist must write the initial letters at the beginning of words and in the middle of words and the finals at the end. If he reverses them the Codex is illegal. It was said in the name of R. Matthew b. Charash מוצפן [= the five final letters] are a law of Moses from Sinai. What is מוצפן? R. Jeremiah said in the name of R. Samuel who said it in the name of R. Isaac, they are what the Seers instituted [מוצפן מוצפן אונים וויינים אונים
¹ Comp. The Massorah, letter **2**, §§ 482, 483, Vol. II, p. 54, and vide supra p. 158 &c.

² Vide supra p. 159.

³ e. g. אר, אין מן ארן &c.

The whole of this anecdote shows that these double letters were then still a novelty and that they had not as yet finally established themselves. As R. Eliezer and R. Joshua lived at the end of the first century and at the beginning of the second century of the present era we cannot be wrong in concluding that these sages then determined to enact that the double letter should be adopted uniformly in writing the sacred Scriptures. As to the story in the Babylon Talmud that the Did Seers, are the Prophets, that these did not discover the double letters, but simply resuscitated them, and that they were originally given to Moses on Sinai, but that they had been forgotten in the course of time, this is manifestly designed to impart to the new invention a divine and most ancient authority and is glaringly like the story about the square

[?] כל האותות הכפולים באלף בית כותב הראשונים בתחילת התיבה ובאמצע התיבה ואת האחרונים בסופה, ואם שינה פסל, משם ר' מתיה בן חרש אמרו מנצפ"ך הלכה למשה מסיני, מהו מנצפ"ך ר' ירמיה בשם ר' שמואל ר' יצחק מה שהתקינו לך הצופים, מאן אינון אלין צופין, מעשה ביום סנריר שלא נכנסו חכמים לבית הועד ונכנסו התינוקות, אמרין איתון נעביד בית וועדא דלא יבטל, אמרין מהו דין דכתיב מ"ם מ"ם, נו"ן נו"ן, צד"י צד"י, פ"ה פ"ה, כ"ף כ"ף, ממאמר למאמר, מנאמן לנאמן, מצדיק לצדיק, מפה לפה, מכף ידו של הקב"ה לכף ידו של משה, וסיימו אותן חכמים ועמדו כולן בני אדם גדולים אמרון ר' ליעזר ור' יהושוע הוון מינהון.

² Comp. Sabbath 104; Megilla 2b-3a.

characters. The explanation, however, of the Jerusalem Talmud which makes the Double Letters the basis of, or rather the mnemonic sign for the giving of the Law on mount Sinai is not the only one which obtained currency among the ancients. The Massorah takes the Five Double Letters as setting forth the deliverance of the Patriarchs Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, the redemption of Israel, the advent of the Messiah the Branch of Righteousness. 2

IV. The introduction of the matres lectionis. facilitate still further the study of the unpointed consonants on the part of the laity, the Scribes gradually introduced into the text the matres lectionis which also served as vowel-letters.3 But in this branch of their labours as is the case in the other branches, the different Schools which were the depositories of the traditions as to the import of the text, exhibited considerable diversity of opinion owing to the fact that the traditions themselves were not uniform. So great indeed was this diversity of opinion about the respective traditions and the import of the text of Scripture circa 300 B. C. that it gave rise to the division of the people into the two national sects the Pharisees and the Sadducees. These were not only the custodians of the diverse ancestral traditions, but of the Bible. They were the official interpreters and redactors of the text in accordance with the views of which their Schools were the representatives. It is, therefore, most important to ascertain what the condition of the consonantal text was on which these different Schools laboured and into which the Sopherim introduced the above-named changes in order to aid the laity in studying the Scriptures. But here we are faced with the difficulty arising from

¹ Vide supra p. 290.

² Comp. The Massorah, letter x, § 228, Vol. I, pp. 36, 37.

³ Vide supra p. 137-157.

the fact that not a single MS. of the Hebrew text has survived which is of a date prior to the Christian era. We are, therefore, deprived of the direct MS. authority to tell us what the actual consonants were which the Sopherim transliterated into the square characters, which they divided into separate words and into which they introduced the Final Letters and the quiescent or vowelletters, in accordance with the traditions deposited in their respective Schools.

V. The consonants of the Hebrew Text and the Septuagint. — In the absence, however, of any MS. of the Apostolic age we have providentially the Greek Version which was made by the Jews circa 250—200 B. C. This Version certainly shows what was the amount, and approximately also indicates what were the consonants of the Hebrew text which obtained in some of the Schools at that period. But before we accept its testimony it will be necessary to examine into the character which this Version bore and what were the opinions which the Spiritual authorities of the Synagogue who had the custody and the redaction of the Hebrew original expressed about this Version. The story of the origin of this Greek translation is told in the so-called Epistle of Aristeas and is briefly as follows:

Aristeas a Pagan, chief officer of the guards, and friend of Ptolemy Philadelphus (285-247 B. C.) writes to his brother Philocrates that he together with Andreas had been despatched by the king as ambassadors with a letter to Eleazar the high priest of Jerusalem to send to Alexandria seventy-two of the most learned men, six of each tribe, to translate for the Royal Library the Divine Law, out of the Hebrew into Greek. To secure this favour from the high priest, Ptolemy not only liberated 100.000 Jewish slaves, whom his father Ptolemy Lagos carried with him to Egypt, and paid 660 talents to their owners, but sent the following presents to Jerusalem. For the Temple, vessels of silver, value seventy talents; vessels of gold, value fifty talents; precious stones to embellish these vessels, value two hundred and fifty talents of gold. For sacrifices and other uses of the Temple one hundred talents.

At the receipt of the royal letter and the munificent presents, Eleazar dispatched seventy-two elders, six of each tribe, with a letter to Ptolemy and a present of his own copy of the Law written in letters of gold. After their arrival, and being feasted and toasted for seven days, during which these elders had to answer seventy-two questions, they were conducted by Demetrius to a superb mansion over the Heptastadium, where they executed the Version in exactly seventy-two days, when Demetrius wrote it down from their dictation. Demetrius then read the Version before the whole assembly of the Jews, who declared it to be an exact and faithful translation. Whereupon a copy of it was made in the presence of the seventy-two interpreters for the rulers of the synagogue; and the Jews, by the desire of Demetrius invoked an imprecation upon any one who should at any time make an alteration in the Version. It was then read over to the king, who was profoundly impressed with the sublimity of its contents and enquired why the poets and historians of other nations did not mention it. To which Demetrius replied that they dared not do it, because the Law is divine, and that the historian Theopompus and the poet Theodectes, who attempted to incorporate it in their writings, were afflicted by God, the one with the loss of his senses, and the other with the loss of his eye-sight. When the king heard this he worshipped God, commanded that the Version should be taken care of, gave each of the seventy-two interpreters three changes of the finest garments, two talents of gold, a cup of one talent, the entire furniture of a room, and sent to Eleazar ten tables with silver feet, and the apparatus thereunto, a cup of thirty talents, and ten changes of garments. Thus loaded with presents the seventytwo interpreters went back to Jerusalem.1

It is now generally admitted that this Epistle which was written about 80. B. C. is apocryphal. Still it was accepted at the time by the official custodians of the Hebrew Scripture both in Palestine and Babylon as based upon current tradition. Philo not only believed in it,2 but states that the Jews of Egypt up to his time annually celebrated the day on which the Septuagint was finished, and Josephus almost reproduces the story of Aristeas.3 The Babylon Talmud, which describes the origin of the

¹ A Critical edition of the Greek text of the Epistle of Aristeas by M. Schmidt appeared in Merx's Archiv, I 241 &c., Halle 1870.

² Comp. Vila Mosis, lib II, § 5-7; ed. Mangey II 138 -141.

³ Comp. Antiq. XII 2; Contra Apion. II, 4.

Greek Version, distinctly declares that it was composed under divine guidance and that in accordance with divine inspiration the seventy-two translators introduced into it certain variations from the Hebrew original as will be seen from the following:

Our Teachers only allowed the Scriptures to be translated into Greek. R. Jehudah said when the Teachers allowed Greek it was only the Pentateuch, and that because of a certain occurrence with respect to king Ptolemy. For we have propounded: It came to pass that king Ptolemy assembled seventy-two elders and placed them respectively in seventy-two cells and did not disclose to them why he had assembled them. He then went to each one separately and said to him: Translate me the Law of Moses your teacher. Whereupon the Holy One, blessed be He, inspired the heart of each of them so that they all came to the same opinion and made the following alterations:

(1) Gen. I 1; (2) Gen. I 26; (3) Gen. II 3; (4) Gen. V 2; (5) Gen. XI 7; (6) Gen. XVIII 12; (7) Gen. XLIX 6; (8) Exod. IV 20; (9) Exod. XII 40; (10) Exod. XXIV 5; (11) Exod. XXIV 11; (12) Numb. XVI 15; (13) Deut. IV 19; (14) Deut. XVII 3; and (15) Levit. XI 6; Deut. XIV 7.

The Version then on which the official custodians of the Sacred original bestowed such high praise exhibits two striking features. It is both slavishly literal in some parts and seriously departs from the present Hebrew in other

וונית לא התירו שיכתבו אלא יונית, ותניא אמר ר' יהודה אף כשהתירו רבותינו יונית לא התירו אלא בספר תורה ומשום מעשה דתלמי המלך דתניא מעשה בתלמי המלך שכינם ע"ב זקנים והכניםן בע"ב בתים ולא גילה להם על מה כינםן ונכנם אצל כל אחד שכינם ע"ב זקנים והכניםן בע"ב בתים ולא גילה להם על מה כינםן ונכנם אצל כל אחד ואחד ואמר להם כתבו לי תורה משה רבכם נתן הקב"ה בלב כל אחד ואחד עצה והסכימו בולן לדעת אחת וכתבו לו אלהים ברא בראשית, אעשה אדם בצלם ובדמות, ויכל ביום הששי וישבות ביום השביעי, זכר ונקבה בראן, ולא כתבו בראם, הבה ארדה ואבלה שם שפתם, ותצחק שרה בקרוביה, כי באפם הרגו שור וברצונם עקרו אבום, ויקה משה את אשתו ואת בניו וירכיבם על נושא בני אדם, ומשב בני ישראל אשר ישבו במצרים ובשאר ארצות שלושים שנה וארבע מאות שנה, וישלח את זאמוםי בני ישראל, ואל לאמוםי בני ישראל לא שלח ידו, לא חמר אחד מהם נשאתי, אשר חלק ה' אלהיך אותם להאיר לכל העמים, וילך ויעבד אלהים אחרים אשר לא צויתי לעבדם, ובתבו לו את צעירת הרגלים ולא כתבו לו את הארנבת מפני שאשתו של תלמי ארנבת שמה שלא בעירת הרגלים ולא כתבו לו את הארנבת מפני שאשתו של תלמי ארנבת שמה בי היהודים: מהולונה באלה באלון בי היהודים: מוכל בולון בי היהודים: משבר להצול בצירת בדמל בולון בי היהודים: מוכל בולון בי היהודים בי וורדים: מוכל בולון בי היהודים בי המוכל בי היהודים בי בי היהודים בי היהודים בי היהודים בי היהודים בי היהודי

parts. In some parts it not only follows the Hebrew order, but reproduces the smallest particles and the peculiar idioms, to such an extent that it can easily be retranslated into Hebrew without changing the order of the words. Thus for instance Gen. XXIV 1:

On the other hand in the midst of literal translations we meet renderings which seriously deviate from the present Hebrew text. A striking illustration of this kind is to be found in Gen. XLI 48. Here the Septuagint translates it:

and he gathered all the food of the seven years, in which was the plenty in the land of Egypt

whereas the Hebrew which is properly translated in the Authorised Version is:

and he gathered up all the food of the seven years, which were in the land of Egypt.

The most cursory examination of the Hebrew text shows that something has dropped out of it and that the Septuagint has preserved that which is missing. The Greek Version, moreover, is easily retranslated into Hebrew and restores the lacuna, viz.

τῶν ἐπτὰ ἐτῶν ἐν οἶς ἦν ἡ εὐθηνία ἐν τἢ γῆ Αἰγύπτου· שבע הָשָׁנִים אשר הָיָה הַשֶּּבֶע בארץ מצרים

That the deviation of the Septuagint has here preserved the text which obtained in those days in one School of textual redactors is corroborated by the Samaritan. The Samaritan recension has the very words which the retranslation of the Greek into Hebrew exhibits. We thus see that *circa* 200 B. C. the different Schools had different redactions. Moreover, from the fact that the Septuagint was held in such high estimation it is evident

that the Hebrew recension from which it was made was then recognised as one of these redactions. The authoritative custodians of the traditions had not as yet decided to issue one uniform text.

Several important events, however, in the development of the Jewish Commonwealth in Palestine now called for a uniform standard of the Sacred text. The people were distracted by their rulers who alternately represented the tenets of Pharisaism and Sadduceeism, each claiming to be the representatives and rightful interpreters of Holy Writ. Alexander Janai, a Sadducee, was succeeded by Queen Salome, whose sympathies were with the Pharisees; she again was succeeded by Aristobulus II, a Sadducee; and he again was followed by his brother Hyrkanus II, who favoured the Pharisees. For an exact parallel we have to go to the commencement of the Reformation in England. England was in like manner distracted by the vacillation of Henry VIII, who one day became the defender of the Roman Catholic faith and another day espoused the cause of Protestantism; by the alternate powers of More, Fisher and Gardiner and Cromwell and Cranmer; by Mary, who succeeded to the throne after the good Protestant Edward VI. As it happened in Palestine so it was in England, a standard text or Version was produced in almost every reign, till at last the recognised authorities fixed upon one which met with general acceptance.

Another great event in the Jewish Commonwealth which contributed to bring about the same result was the establishment of public Schools throughout the country. Simon b. Shetach (80 B. C.) introduced Upper Schools or academies in every large provincial town and ordained that all young men from the age of sixteen were to visit them. At the age of five, moreover, every boy had to

Comp. Jer. Kelhubolh VIII 11.

learn to read the Bible. As a consequence it was strictly enacted that the greatest care was to be taken that the copies of the sacred books from which the Sopherim imparted instruction should be accurately written. It is to these facts that Josephus refers when he declares "our principal care of all is to educate our children".

The institution of reading the Pentateuch in triennial and annual Pericopes in every Synagogue with the corresponding lessons from the Prophets and the Hagiographa,⁴ as well as the extensive use of the Psalter in the Temple service also contributed to the necessity of producing a uniform and standard text. The Sabbatic lessons were respectively divided into seven small sections which were read by seven different people who were called up to the rostrum by the congregation or its chief to perform this function.⁵ It would, therefore, have occasioned the greatest confusion in mind of the reader and indeed have shaken his faith, if the few verses which he had to read in one Synagogue exhibited one text, whilst the same portion which he should happen to read in another Synagogue disclosed a different recension.

These combined circumstances imposed the responsible task upon the official custodians of the sacred text to undertake a thorough sifting of the various traditions, to collate the different recensions, and to give to the laity an authorised Bible. This redaction is substantially the same which we now possess. It was primarily directed against the MSS, which exhibited the recension from

¹ Comp. Aboth V 21.

² Comp. Pesachim 12a.

³ Josephus, Contra Apion. I 12.

⁴ Comp. Acts XV 21; Josephus, Contra Apion. II 17; Mishna, Megilla IV 4.

⁵ Comp. Mishna, Megilla IV 2.

which the Septuagint Version was made, as well as against the Hebrew text of the Samaritans. The original MSS. which belonged to these Schools and which at that period could not have been many, were readily disposed of by consigning them to the sacred recepticle called the Geniza.1 But the Greek Version itself, like the Samaritan recension, was beyond the control of the Sopherim, and hence could not be destroyed. To meet this emergency it was declared that it was not made by the seventy-two elders representing every tribe of the whole Jewish nation, but by five and that the day on which it was made was as calamitous to Israel as the day on which the golden calf was substituted for the true God, because the Thorah cannot adequately be reproduced in a translation.2 This anathema was afterwards emphasised by describing its accomplishment as a national calamity which was preceded by three days of darkness and by placing the day on which it was finished among the other dies nefasti on the eighth of Tebeth.3 It was during the period, therefore, which intervened between the ascription of divine authority to the Septuagint and its being publicly anathematised that the present textus receptus was being gradually developed and redacted by the Sopherim or the authorised custodians of the ancestral traditions. The portions of the Hebrew Scriptures which diverged most in the recension used by the translators of the Septuagint from the redaction put forth by the Sopherim are Samuel, Jeremiah, Proverbs, Job, Esther and Daniel. These were probably the primary

י Vide supra p. 156.
מעשה בחמשה זקנים שכתבז לתלמי המלך את התורה יונית והיה היום קשה ²
מעשה בו הענל שלא היתה התורה יכולה להתרגם כל צרכה:
Massecheth Sepher Thorah I; Sopherim I 7.
בשמונה בטבת נכתבה התורה יונית בימי תלמי המלך ובא חושך לעולם נ' ימים ³

cause for the activity of the spiritual authorities to issue a uniform and standard text.

The post-canonical authoritative Jewish writings record sundry rules by which the Sopherim were guided in the redaction of the text. Some of these canons are now an integral part of the Massorah, whilst others which are of supreme importance have only been preserved in the Talmud and in the Midrashim. These records reveal to us the reasons why certain letters, words, phrases and whole sections have an abnormal appearance both in the Massoretic MSS. and in the printed text; why some expressions and proper names in parallel passages are apparently at variance with each other. It is, therefore, necessary to remark at the outset that these Sopherim were not simply copyists. They were the authorised revisers of the text. They not only decided which books are canonical, but which of the various readings are to be inserted into the text and which are to be put into the margin, which and in what manner certain of the Divine names are to be guarded against irreverence and which of the names of idols are to be stigmatized, which of the cacophonous expressions are to be changed into euphemisms &c. &c.

One of the classical passages which record the functions of the Sopherim in this respect is to be found in the Babylon Talmud (*Nedarim* 37 b—38 a) and is as follows: 1

למשה מסיני מקרא סופרים ועיטור סופרים וקריין ולא כתיבן וכתיבן ולא קריין הלכה למשה מסיני מקרא סופרים ארץ ארץ שמים מצרים עיטור סופרים אחר תעבורו אחר תלך אחר תאסף קדמו שרים אחר נוגנים. צדקתך כהררי אל קריין ולא כתיבן פרת דבלכתו איש דכאשר ישאל איש בדבר האלהים באים דנבנתה לה דפליטה את דהגד הוגד אלי איש בדבר האלהים באים וכתיבן ולא קריין נא דיסלח ואת דהמצוה דהגורן אלי דהשעורים הלין קריין ולא כתיבן ולא קריין ולא הלין כתיבן ולא קריין ולא קריין ולא קריין ולא קריין וא הלין כתיבן ולא קריין ולא קריין ולא פריין וא א הלין בתיבן ולא קריין ולא פריין וואר ין וואר פריין וואר

The pronunciation fixed by the Sopherim, the cancelling \lceil of $\lceil Vav \rceil$ by the Sopherim, words read which are not written in the text, and vice versa words written in the text which are cancelled in reading, are a law of Moses on Sinai [= according to a very ancient tradition]. The pronunciation fixed by the Sopherim are for example ארץ land, country, which is pronounced אָרץ when preceded by the article, i. e. רָאָריִם the land, שַׁמַיִם heaven, מִצְרַיִם heaven, מִצְרַיִם Egypt &c. [which have a dual form without being duals]. The cancelling [of Vav] by the Sopherim is to be found four times in the word אָדֶר after, viz. Gen. XVIII 5; XXIV 55; Numb. XXXI 2; Ps. LXVIII 26; in לישקטיך thy righteousness (Ps. XXXVI 7) &c. Words read which are not written in the text are איש בער Euphrates (2 Sam. VIII 3), איש a man (2 Sam. XVI 23), לה they are coming (Jerem. XXXI 38), לה to her (Jerem. L 29), אום (Ruth II II), אבלי to me (Ruth III 5, 17). These words are read though they are not in the text. The following words on the contrary are written in the text, but are cancelled in reading, אַ I pray (2 Kings V 18); מאָל and (Jerem. XXXII II); דרוף let him bend (Jerem, LI 3); five (Ezek. XLVIII 16); אָל if (Ruth III 12). These words are written in the text, but are cancelled in reading.

- I. Mikra Sopherim. The first rule which relates to the pronunciation of certain forms is simply grammatical and does not constitute a difference of opinion between the Schools of redactors.
- II. Itur Sopherim (משור סופרים). The second canon, however, which is called Itur Sopherim does affect the text inasmuch as it authoritatively declares that the words in question are to be read without the Vav conjunctive. The rule is manifestly directed against the recensions of the other Schools and notably against the Septuagint and Samaritan which read these words with the Vav conjunctive as may be seen from my notes on these passages. In common with the majority of the Massoretic MSS. and the editions, I have given the reading of the Sopherim in the text and the alternative reading in the margin, where the student will find the textual reading in each case described as being one of the Itur Sopherim. It will be seen that the record here does not specify the number of passages

which come within this denomination. We must, therefore, not take it for granted that these are all the instances which exhibit the variations between the different Schools as to the presence or absence of the Vav conjunctive. The notes in my edition of the Massoretic text on Gen. XXXI 36; XLVII 11; Exod. XVII 2, 10; XXII 29; XXIII 13, 28; XXIV 20; Levit. XX 18; Numb. VIII 4; Deut. XIV 16 &c. &c., show, beyond doubt, that the differences in the Schools comprised a much larger number and that the instances mentioned under the Itur Sopherim are simply typical examples. Later Massorites, however, mistook these typical instances for an exhaustive List and hence added the heading to this Rubric four words or five words are &c.1

III. Words read which are not written in the text (קריין ולא כתיבן). — The third category consists of words which according to the Sopherim have dropped out of the text and which are to be supplied in reading. They are as follows:

י מלין עטור סופרים ד' comp. The Massorah, letter צ, § 274, Vol. II, p. 384.

² Comp. 2 Sam. X 16; also Gen. XXXI 21; Exod. XXIII 31; Ps. LXXII 8 &c.

uniform. This is the cause why the expression not Euphrates, has found its way into the text here in some MSS., editions and ancient Versions as will be seen from the note in my edition of the Bible. The Authorised Version has also inserted it into the text, whilst the Revised Version relegates it to the margin.

- (2) 2 Sam. XVI 23. The text as it now stands denotes: "And the counsel of Ahithophel, which he counselled was in those days, as if he inquired at the oracle [or word] of God." According to another recension, however, there was the expression איש a man, any one &c., in the text after the verb ישאל he inquired, and the passage is, therefore, to be translated: "And the counsel of Ahithophel which he counselled in those days was as if a man [or any one] had inquired at the oracle of God." This reading is exhibited in some MSS., in several of the early editions and in the ancient Versions. The Authorised Version which follows the Keri in the former passage without taking any notice of the Kethiv [= textual reading], consistently does the same thing here, whereas the Revised Version which on the contrary follows the *Kethiv* [= the textual reading] in the former passages and relegates the Keri to the margin, inconsistently inserts the Keri here into the text and takes no notice whatever of the Kethiv [= the textual reading].
- (3) Jerem. XXXI 38. Here the ancient redactors state that the word are coming, has dropped out of the text and direct us to supply it in reading, but they themselves do not insert it into the text though its omission in this common phrase is most glaring. It is, however, in the text of many MSS., several of the early editions and in the ancient Versions as will be seen from the note in my edition of the Bible. The cause of its omission here is very instructive inasmuch as it throws light

on similar omissions elsewhere. On looking at the text it will be seen that the word באים = באם are coming, and the expression caith, are extremely alike. Hence when the Scribe had written one and looked up again at his prototype he naturally thought he had already copied both and proceeded with the text.

- (4) Jerem. L 29. The variation here is simply recensional and does not affect the sense of the passage. According to the *Kethiv* [= the textual reading] the phrase literally means "let there be no escape", i. e. let none escape, whereas according to the Keri we are to supply in reading the expression and nuto her, which makes it "let there be unto her no escape". This variant is manifestly due to the difficulty felt by the later redactors in combining the masculine verb יהי with the feminine noun פּלִישָה escape, deliverance, especially in the face of verse 26 which is undoubtedly the cause of the alternative reading. But it is well known that when the verb precedes the noun it does not always conform to it in gender (comp. Deut. XXXII 38 &c.). It is to be remarked that the Septuagint and Vulgate which follow the Kethiv or the older recension read here פלישה her escape.
- (5) Ruth II 11. Here too the variation does not affect the sense of the passage, but is simply dialectical. According to the Kethiv it is simply 5 all, and the Keri directs us to supply the accusative particle שַׁת before כֹל and read את־בל. Though this is here distinctly given as one of the passages in which a word is to be supplied in reading it is not included in the Massoretic Rubric on this subject. The Massorah, however, describes the absence and presence of the particle in question as constituting one of the differences between the Western and Eastern recensions of the text. This is duly recorded in the note on this passage in my edition of the Bible.

- (6) Ruth III 5. The two recensions exhibited here affect the expression אַלִי unto me. According to the Kethiv it is simply "all that thou sayest", whilst the Keri directs us to insert in reading the word אַלִי unto me, i. e. "all that thou sayest unto me". The former recension without the expression unto me, is preserved in some MSS., in the Septuagint and in the Vulgate, the latter is exhibited in the text in many MSS., in several of the early editions, in the Chaldee and in the Syriac, though the Sopherim themselves did not venture to insert it into the text. The Authorised Version follows the Keri, whilst the Revised Version follows the Kethiv and gives the Keri in the margin.
- (7) Ruth III 17. The seventh and last instance given in the Talmudic record where we are directed to insert a word in reading which is not in the text affects the same expression with me. As in the preceding passage the Keri is exhibited in the text in many MSS., in several of the early editions, in the Chaldee, the Septuagint and the Syriac. Here too the Authorised Version adopts the Keri, whilst the Revised Version follows the textual reading and gives the Keri in the margin.

It will be seen from the above that this ancient record does not specify the number of the passages where words have been omitted from the text. The instances are, therefore, simply to be taken as typical. That there existed more passages in the recensions of other Schools where words had dropped out of the text is evident from the parallel Rubric in the Massorah which treats on the same subject. Whilst the Massoretic List omits the fifth instance, viz. Ruth II II which is probably due to the fact

¹ Comp. The Massorah, letter 5, § 487, Vol. II, pp. 54, 55.

that it constitutes one of the differences between the Westerns and Easterns, it adds the following four passages:

- (1) Judg. XX 13. Here the Massorah tells us the word בני sons of, has dropped out of the text and directs us to supply it in reading. In looking at the text the cause of its omission is perfectly clear. It is due to the fact that the first half of the word בנימן Benjamin, by which it is immediately followed is and the Scribe naturally thought that he had already written it. This affords an instructive illustration of the source of some clerical mistakes. As the sense of the passage is the same with or without the expression in question, the textual critics of the different Schools were not agreed upon its being an omission. Hence some MSS. and early editions have no Keri and they are supported by verse 20 of this very chapter, others have the Keri whilst other MSS. again have בני sons of, in the text which is also exhibited in the Chaldee, the Septuagint and the Syriac, as will be seen in the note in my edition of the Bible. The Authorised Version adopts the Keri, whilst the Revised Version follows the textual reading and puts the Keri into the margin.
- (2) 2 Sam. XVIII 20. According to the testimony of the Massorah the expression 13 has here dropped out of the text and we are told in the Keri to supply it in reading, so as to make it conformable to the well-known phrase denoting for, therefore, because. Here again the omission is due to the same cause which gave rise to the former clerical error. 13 is immediately followed by 13 and as the two expressions are very much alike the Scribe omitted one.

י Comp. פייעל בן Gen. XVIII 5; XIX 8; XXXVIII 26; Jerem. XXIX 27; XXXVIII 4.

(3) 2 Kings XIX 31. — In the redaction of some textual critics the reading here simply was קנאח יהוה the zeal of Jehovah, and thus differed from the parallel passage in Isa. XXXVII 32. In the codices, however, which the Massorites took for their standard the two passages were identical. Hence the direction in the Keri that אנראות of hosts, should be supplied here in reading. Still the evidence for the former reading must have been very strong since the Massorites did not insert the word into the text though they believed it to have dropped out of it. Many MSS., early editions and the Versions have the Keri in the text as will be seen from the note in my edition of the Bible. The Authorised Version adopts the Keri, and the Revised Version translates the textual reading, but puts the Keri in the margin.

(4) 2 Kings XIX 37. — The fact that the Massorah directs us to supply the word אוֹז sons, in reading, shows, beyond doubt, that according to the recension of some Schools it was absent from the text here. For this reason the Massorites themselves did not insert it into the text, but simply put down the Keri against it in the margin. That it was, however, the textual reading in the redaction of other Schools in harmony with the parallel passage in Jerem. XXXVII 38, is attested by many MSS., several of the early editions and the ancient Versions as will be seen from the note in my edition of the Bible. Here too the Authorised Version adopted the Keri, whilst the Revised Version translates the textual reading and puts the Keri in the margin.

On a comparison of the ancient record in the Talmud with the Rubric in the Massorah it will be seen that the latter not only omits one instance and adds four new passages, but that in the heading to the Rubric it fixes the number of places where a word has dropped out of the text to ten. But as we have already seen, this number is based upon later redactions and in the earlier recensions there were many more such omissions. The effect, however, of this Rubric on the external appearance of the text in these ten passages is remarkable. In many of the MSS. and editions there is a vacant space left in the text sufficient to contain the missing word and the vowelsigns which belong to the Keri in the margin occupy by themselves the lower part of the empty space. This device, however, which imparts to the text such an abnormal appearance cannot be of very ancient date. Two out of the ten passages in question occur in the Latter Prophets, viz. Jerem. XXXI 39; L 29. Now the St. Petersburg Codex dated A. D. 916 which contains this portion of the Hebrew Bible duly notes the Keri in the margin, but does not exhibit this phenomenal vacant space in the text. The later development of this vacant space according to my opinion is due to the fact that these missing words were inserted into the text in many MSS. and that the Massoretic Revisers scratched them out except the vowelsigns and put in the margin against each passage the Keri. To avoid the process of obliteration and to guard the Scribes against copying these words into the text they left the curious vacant space with vowel-signs below and accents above. On comparing Judg. XX 13; 2 Sam. VIII 3 and XVIII 20 in Oriental 2201 which is dated A. D. 1246 the student will come to the same conclusion. In accordance with my principle, therefore, I have left the Kethiv unpointed, given the vowel-signs of both the Kethiv and the Keri in the notes and have discarded the vacant space.

IV. Words written in the text, but cancelled in reading. — According to the same authoritative statement, we are assured that words have erroneously crept into the text which must be cancelled. As in the former case, so here the ancient redactors did not themselves remove them from the text of their redaction, but marked them in the margin as spurious. They are as follows:

(1) 2 Kings V 18. — From the MSS., the early editions and the ancient Versions it is evident that there existed a great difference of opinion in some recensions with regard to the presence or absence of the particle xi now, I pray thee, in the verse before us. In Harley 5710-11 which is one of the most beautiful and accurately written MSS. this particle is in both clauses after the verb יְּסֵלָּח and there is a separate Massorah against each of them, remarking that it is to be cancelled. In other MSS. the particle in question is absent in both clauses. This is also the case in the first edition of the Prophets, Soncino 1485 - 86; the first edition of the entire Bible, Soncino 1488; the second edition, Naples 1491-93; the third edition, Brescia 1494; the Chaldee, the Syriac and the Vulgate. In the majority of MSS., however, the particle x2 only occurs in the second clause and it is here that we are told that it must be cancelled to make it uniform with the first clause. The Septuagint shows that it was in the second clause in the recension from which this Greek Version was made and that it was then not considered spurious.

(2) Jerem. XXXII וו. — There can be no doubt that the ancient recensions differed here with regard to the presence or absence of the particle before לוב ליי the legal document. According to the record preserved in the Talmud, the textual reading was originally מוֹלְיוֹר and the redactors direct us to cancel אַרְר בּשׁרוּן. But though the Massoretic Rubric which tabulates the spurious words does not contain the passage before us, the original reading וֹאַת־המצוה is still exhibited as the Kethiv or textual reading in the St. Petersburg Codex dated A. D. 916 for

which the Keri substitutes וְהַמְצְוָה. The latter is the textual reading in the editio princeps of the Prophets, Soncino 1485–86, and in the first edition of the entire Bible, Soncino 1488.

(3) Jerem. LI 3. — According to the testimony of this ancient record we have here an instance of dittography where the Scribe has by mistake copied the same word twice. Hence we are authoritatively directed to cancel the second ידרך he shall bend, in reading. The condemned expression is not exhibited in the text in Add. 21161, in the first edition of the entire Bible, Soncino 1488, nor in the third edition Brescia 1494. This, however, is not the only variation in the verse before us. The particles אול and אול against, and אול against, and אול against, and אול and אול and אול and not. Accordingly the verse is to be rendered:

Let not the archer bend his bow Nor let him lift himself up in his coat of mail &c.

This is also the reading in the first edition of the Bible, Soncino 1488; in the third edition Brescia 1494; the Chaldee in the second clause, the Syriac, and the Vulgate; and is adopted in the text of the Revised Version. The Authorised Version follows the *Kethiv*.

- (4) Ezek. XLVIII 16. We have here another instance of dittography, the scribe having by mistake written שמח five twice. Hence we are directed to cancel the second מבח in reading. Many MSS. have not got it in the text nor is it exhibited in the editio princeps of the Bible, Soncino 1488; the third edition, Brescia 1494; the Chaldee, the Septuagint, the Syriac and the Vulgate.
- (5) Ruth III 12. The direction that the particle אָם here is superfluous after בי and is to be cancelled, is

due to a dialectical use of it at a later period of the language. Hence some recensions in conformity with the earlier usage dropped it, whilst other redactors retained it. The Massorah has two Rubrics on the presence and absence of this particle.¹

It will be seen that the record in the Talmud does not fix the number of these superfluous or spurious expressions in the text, but simply leaves us to regard them as typical instances. The oldest separate Rubric in the Massorah on this point is contained in the St. Petersburg Codex dated A. D. 916. This important MS. gives the List twice, once on Jerem, XXXIX 12 and once on Ezek. XLVIII 16, and in both instances fixes the number at eight. The eight passages are made up by the addition of three more examples where the particle at is described as superfluous and is to be cancelled (2 Sam. XIII 33; XV 21; Jerem. XXXIX 12); by the inclusion of Jerem. XXXVIII וו where it tells us that the particle את before אשר is spurious and is to be elided, and by the omission of Jerem. XXXI 11 which is one of the five passages given in the earlier record in the Talmud.

V. The fifteen Extraordinary points. — Hitherto we have considered the ancient record with regard to words which have dropped out of the text and which are supplied in the margin of the MSS and editions, as well as words which have crept into the text and which the marginal notes both in the MSS and editions direct us to elide. These Massoretic glosses and directions leave no doubt as to their import. We now come to an equally ancient and probably a much older official document which is the cause of the abnormal appearance of no fewer than fifteen words in the Hebrew Bible, but about which the

¹ Comp. The Massorah, letter N, §§ 742, 743, Vol. I, p. 82.

marginal glosses give no solution. All the information which the puzzled student gets in the margin of the MSS. and the printed text against each of these enigmatic expressions is that the letter or word in question has an extraordinary point. And yet these points are of supreme importance inasmuch as they exhibit the earliest result of textual criticism on the part of the Scribes. The record on this point has been transmitted in several of the post-Biblical writings. The oldest form of it which is in the Siphri on Numb. IX 10 is as follows:

- (1) Numb. IX 10. The Hc (ה) in החקה afar off, is pointed [to denote] that even he who is on a short journey and is defiled must not offer with them the Passover. So also
- (2) Gen. XVI 5. "The Lord judge between me and thee" [is pointed] because she [i. e. Sara] said this to him [i. e. Abraham], only with respect to Hagar. Some, however, are of opinion that it is with respect to those who caused strife between him and her. So also
- (3) Gen. XVIII 9. "And they said unto him where is Sara thy wife?" [is pointed] because they knew where she was. So also

י או בדרך החוקה נקוד על הה"א אפ" בדרך קרובה והוא ממא לא היה עושה עמהם את הפסח: כיוצא בו ישפוט ה' ביני ובינך שלא אמרה לו אלא על הגר בלבד, וייא על המטיליי מריבה בינו לבינה: כיוצא בו ויאמרו אליו איה שרה אשתך שהיו יודעים היכן היא: כיוצא בו ולא ידע בשכבה ובקומה נקוד על ובקומה לומר בשכבה לא ירע ובקומה ידע: כיוצא בו וישקהו שלא נשקו בכל לבו. ר"ש בן יוחי אומר הלכה בידוע שעשו שונא ליעקב אלא נהפכו רחמיו באותה שעה ונשקו בכל לבו: כיוצא בו וילכו אחיו לרעות את צאן אכיהם נקוד עליו שלא הלכו אלא לרעות את עצמם: כיוצא בהם ונשים עד נופח אשר עד מידבא נקוד עליו שאף מלהלן היה כן: כיוצא בו כל פקודי הלוים אשר פקד משה ואהרן נקוד עליו שלא היה אהרן מן המנין: ביוצא בו עשרון עשרון נקוד עשרון [על] שלא היה אלא עשרון אחד בלבד: כיוצא בו הנסתרות לה' אלהינו והנגלות לנו ולבנינו עד עולם נקוד. א"ל עשיתם הגלוים אף אני אודיע לכם את הנסתרות. אף כאן אתה אומר בררך רחוקה נקוד עליו שאפיי היה בדרך קרובה והיה ממא לא היה עושה עמהם את הפסח: Siphra, fol. 18a, ed. Friedmann, Vienna 1864; Comp. also Aboth di Rabbi Nathan, Recension I, cap. XXXIV, p. 100 and Recension II, cap. XXXVII, p. 97, ed. Schechter, London 1887; Midrash Rabba Numb. IX 10, Parasha III, No. 13, p. 20, ed. Wilna 1878; Sopherim cap. VI; Midrash Mishle XXVI 24.

- (4) Gen. XIX 33. "And he knew not when she lay down nor when she arose", the point on בקומה nor when she arose, denotes that he [i. e. Lot] knew not when she lay down, but that he did know when she arose. So also
- (5) Gen. XXXIII 4. "And he kissed him" וישקהו [is pointed] because he did not kiss him sincerely. R. Simon b. Yochai says Esau was indeed hostile to Jacob, but his bowels had then changed and he did kiss him sincerely. So also
- (6) Gen. XXXVII 12. "And his brethren went to feed his father's flock in Shechem" is pointed because they only went to feed themselves. Likewise
- (7) Numb. XXI 30. "And we have laid them waste even unto Nopha" is pointed because from thenceforward it was likewise so. So also
- (8) Numb. III 39. "All that were numbered of the Levites, which Moses and Aaron numbered" is pointed because Aaron was not of those who numbered.
- (9) Numb. XXIX 15. "And a tenth a tenth" the points are on נשרון tenth, because there was only one tenth measure in the Sanctuary. So also
- (10) Deut. XXIX 28. "The secrets unto the Lord our God and the revealed unto us and to our children for ever", is pointed to denote that when ye shall perform the things which are revealed I will also reveal to you the things which are concealed. So also Numb. IX 10.

Both the Midrash Rabba on Numb. III 39 and the Aboth di Rabbi Nathan supplement the enumeration of the ten instances with the following important statement:

Some say what do these points signify? Now Ezra [who has put them there] declares if Elias should come and say to me why hast thou written them [i. e. these spurious words?], I will answer him I have already furnished them with points. But if he should say thou hast written them correctly, then I will readily erase the points on them.

It will thus be seen that the points were regarded by the ancient authorities as marking the letters and words in question as spurious and that the Prophet Elias, who is to solve all doubts and difficulties, will give his decision on them when he appears. The practice of using dots to stigmatize words as spurious was not restricted to those days. Later scribes continued the example of the ancient Sopherim, as may be seen by the student of Hebrew MSS. As the St. Petersburg Codex dated A. D. 916 is both the oldest dated MS, and is easily accessible to students in Professor Strack's fac-simile, I will restrict my references to this important reproduction. In Isa. LI 4, folio 41 b the word אים isles, is thus stigmatized in the text and שמי my people, is substituted in the margin. In Ezek. XIV 11, folio 133 the word מעלי from me, is dotted and מאחרי from me, is given in the margin as the proper reading.² Here the superlinear position of the vowel-points precluded the dots from being put on the top of the word and they are, therefore, put inside the letter.3 Students of Palaeography know that it was also the practice of scribes who copied Greek and Latin MSS., to indicate erasures by placing dots above words and passages.4

With these facts before us we shall be better able to examine the fifteen dotted passages in the Hebrew Bible. It will be noticed that the ancient authorities already quoted only tabulate the ten instances in the Pentateuch. The other five passages which occur in the Prophets and in the Hagiographa are minutely described in the Massorah.

¹ Though the combination of אָנִים isles, and יְאָמִים people, is to be found in Isa. XLI 1; XLIX 1.

² The passage, however, in Ezek. XLIV 10 favours the stigmatized reading.

³ For other examples see Ezek. XIV 13, fol. 133; XX 7, fol. 140 a; Hag. I 11, fol. 209 b; Hag. II 21, fol. 211 a; Zech I 3, fol. 211 b.

⁴ Comp. Wattenbach, Schriftlafeln zur griechischen Palaeographie, plate V, col. I, line 24 where KAI is given as an instance from the Codex Sinaiticus; Gardthausen, Griechische Palaeographie pp. 278, 279, Leipzig 1879; Thompson, Handbook of Greek and Latin Palaeography p. 74, London 1893.

322 Introduction

As the Siphri is the oldest document from which all the other Lists are derived, it is essential to examine the import of these instances according to the record in the original source. We shall, therefore, discuss the respective passages in the order in which they are given in the Siphri.

(ו) Numb. IX 10 which is the first passage is also given at the end of the List. In the first place it is stated that the He in the word רחקה afar off, is pointed, whereas at the end of the List after quoting again the phrase in a journey afar off, we are simply told that it is pointed (נקור עליו), without specifying which word or letter is thus distinguished. On comparing, however, the wording in Nos. 6, 7, 8 and 10 it will be seen that the latter harmonises with the phrase commonly used in these instances, that it is the original formula and that the specifying of the He is due to a later explanation or expansion.

The explanation which follows, stating the reason why the phrase before us is pointed, clearly indicates where the points are to be. We are here told that even he who is on a short journey, if he is defiled must not offer the Passover. This shows beyond doubt that there was in the original text a letter or word which when cancelled yielded the sense required for this legal inference. On comparing this verse with verse 13 we see that the original reading in verse 10 was ILLLY. As the Vav is ordinarily the conjunctive, the passage may have been taken by some to denote that only he is to offer the second Passover who was at the time of the first Passover both defiled and on a journey. Hence the Vav in ILLLY which is sometimes disjunctive was pointed to indicate that it should be in or, and it is this in which now stands

¹ Comp. Exod. XII 5; XXI 15, 17; 1 Kings XVIII 27 &c.

for the originally pointed Vav (ו) in ובדֵרָך or on a journey. t From the uniform reference to the He (7) in all the ancient documents which treat on the extraordinary points, it is evident that the variation in the passage before us also extended to the word רחקה afar off, which some MSS. read with He and others had it רחק without He. As דְּרֶדְּ way, journey, which is epicene is more frequently construed with a masculine adjective, the He was pointed to denote that here too the larger number of MSS, had it without He and that it is, therefore, to be elided. Instances where both nouns and verbs read in some MSS, with He at the end and in other MSS. without, are also discussed in other parts of the Talmud and whole Lists of them are given in the Massorah.² At a later time when the spiritual guides of the nation were anxious to diminish the number of spurious letters and words in the Hebrew Scriptures, the reference to the reading וּבְדֶרֶךְ and אוֹ בְדֵרֶךְ was dropped and the variation with regard to the He alone was retained. It was then that the legal inference deduced from the reading או בדרך = ובדרך was assigned to the pointed He (ה) which has been the cause of all the confusion.

(2) Gen. XVI 5. — It will be seen that here this early record simply quotes the sentence "the Lord judge between me and thee" as pointed, without specifying the letter or word which is spurious. The explanation, however, which follows, clearly shows that the Yod and Kaph (ק") are to be pointed and, therefore, are to be elided, since it supplies the letter He (ה) in their place reading it

¹ Comp. the able discussion on this point by Blau, Masoretische Untersuchungen, p. 25 &c. Strassburg 1891 to which I am greatly indebted. Dr. Blau properly emphasises the fact that the explanation which follows the respective passages indicates the dotted letters and words.

² Comp. Jerusalem Megilla I 9; IV 10; Sopherim VI 4; and vide supra p. 144 &c.

and her, i. e. Hagar. Accordingly the passage is to be rendered: "the Lord judge between me and her". This fully agrees with the immediately preceding verse. According to the opinion of others the Kaph (ק) is to be pointed and He and Mem (מה) are to take the place of the elided letter, thus reading it וביניה and them, and the passage is to be translated: "the Lord judge between me and them", i. e. my traducers, those who stir up strife. The Massoretic note in some MSS. נקוד על יוך בתרא the second Yod is pointed, is probably due to a later mistaken solution of the original נקוד על יו׳ בתרא.

(3) Gen. XVII 9. — Here too the Siphri simply quotes the sentence "and they said unto him where is thy wife Sarah?" as pointed, without saying which word or letters are stigmatized. The explanation, however, which contains the reason for the extraordinary points indicates the word. It is pointed we are told because "they knew where she is", which plainly declares that the interrogative expression איה where, is dotted and is to be elided, and that the sentence exhibits a positive statement. Accordingly the passage is to be rendered: "And they said unto him, As to Sarah thy wife and he [interruptingly] said behold she is in the tent and he [i. e. the angel resuming] said I will certainly return unto thee according to the time of life and Sarah thy wife shall have a son". This is confirmed by the second recension of Aboth di Rabbi Nathan cap. XXXVII, p. 97, and Sopherim VI 3, which distinctly say that the dotted expression is the interrogative איה where. The reading, however, exhibited in these ancient authorities is not the only variant which obtained in the MSS. The Codices in other Schools indicate that it is the word אליו unto him, which is dotted and hence is to be elided in accordance with some redactions or that the letters Aleph and Yod

¹ Comp. Dikdukē Sopherim on Baba Metzia 87 a; Dikdukē Ha-Teamim § 46.

CHAP. XI.

(אֹל') in אליו unto him, have the points, thus reading it is to him. It may be that the dots extended also to the Vav in ויאמרו (i. e. יֹאמֹן) and that the original reading was and he said to him. This is confirmed by the Septuagint.

- (4) Gen. XIX 33, 35. The classical passage in the Siphri tells us that in the sentence "and he (Lot) knew not when she lay down nor when she arose", which occurs in verses 33 and 35, the word ובקומה nor when she arose, is pointed (= is to be elided) "because he did know when she arose". The desire on the part of later redactors to reduce as much as possible the number of spurious letters in the Bible gave rise to the opinion transmitted in the Massorah that it is simply the second Vav in the first passage where וֹבְקוֹמָה nor when she arose, in verse 33 it is plene, which has the dot, distinguishing it from in verse 34 where it is defective, because Lot knew only when the elder daughter arose, but did not know when the younger one arose. The device, however, is too transparent since the presence of the letter Vav could not possibly indicate the restoration of consciousness on the part of Lot to know the infamy of the act into which he had been ensnared. Indeed in some MSS, the whole word is dotted.1
- (5) Gen. XXXIII 4. Here the word מחל and he kissed him, is dotted because it was not in the MSS. of the text. The passage is, therefore, to be rendered: "and he fell on his neck and they wept". This is in accordance with the usage in Genesis of the combined verbs "to fall on the neck and weep" (XLV 14; XLVI 29) without kissing.
- (6) Gen. XXXVII 12. In the primitive record in the Siphri the passage "and his brethren went to feed their

¹ Comp. Rashi on this passage in Berliner's edition 18 6.

father's flock in Shechem" is adduced with the remark that it has dots. But though it does not state on which letters the dots are, it is manifest from the reason given for the dots in question, viz. they only went to feed themselves, that the words which have the points and which are to be elided are אָרֹיבְאָן אָבִיהִם their fathers flock. This yields the sense required by the reason given for the dots, viz. "and his brethren went to feed in Shechem", and this is in harmony with the phrase in the following verse where it is stated הלוא אחיה רעים בשכם are not thy brethren feeding in Shechem? Owing to the anxiety, however, to diminish as much as possible the indication of spurious words in the Bible, later authorities though retaining the same reason for the dots restrict them to the simple sign of the accusative, regardless of the incongruity that the absence of this particle is made to yield the sense they went to eat and to drink and to be merry (לאכול ולשתות ולהתפתות).1

(7) Numb. XXI 30. — It is remarkable that the Siphri which has hitherto plainly indicated the dotted letters or words in the reason assigned for the extraordinary points, fails us in this instance. After quoting the passage מוש and we have laid waste unto Nopha which is unto Medeba, this primitive record remarks "it has dots because even from thence forward it was also thus". All we can deduce from this explanation is that by the dotting or cancelling of some letter or word in the passage in question, we obtain a rule which is to guide the conquerors in future how to treat the conquered people or cities. But what the original reading was which yields this sense it is impossible to say. The first recension of the Aboth di Rabbi Nathan emphatically states that it is

³ Comp. Midrash Rabba on Numb. IX 10 and Aboth di Rabbi Nathan first recension cap. XXXIV, p. 100, ed. Schechter.

the letter Resh (1) in which, which has the dot, to teach us that the Israelites destroyed the people, but did not destroy the cities, whereas the Midrash which also says that the Resh has the point, on the contrary declares in the name of the minority it is designed to teach us that the conquerors did not destroy the people, but only the cities. No amount of ingenuity, however, can in the present day deduce this sense from the presence or absence of the simple dot on the letter Resh.

That the present text is defective and that some dots were originally designed to indicate its imperfection of which the Resh in אשר exhibits one of the variants, is demonstrated by the Samaritan and the Septuagint. The recension from which the Septuagint was made was:

וְנִינֶם אבר חשבון ער דיבן וְנָשִׁים עֹר נָפָּחָ אֵש עַל־מוֹאַב

And their seed shall perish from Heshbon to Dibon And the women have yet kindled a fire against Moab.

This Version, therefore, cancels the dotted Resh, and with this the Samaritan coincides. It is, moreover, to be remarked that the Talmud not only reads the fire, but takes a verb denoting to blow, to fan, to kindle.3

As the Septuagint undoubtedly shows that ונשים in the first clause was read in some MSS. מול and women, the plural of אָשָׁה, it is far more in consonance with the parallelism and the rhythm of the line to point א in the second clause איש men. An exactly parallel case where the Resh in אשר, according to the Massorah, is superfluous

ונשים עד נופח אשר עד מידבא נקוד על רי״ש שבאשר למה מלמד שהרחיבו האומות ולא הרחיבו המדינות.

יש מלמר ביו עד נפח אשר נקוד על רי״ש שבאשר שאף מלהלן היה כן, וי״א מלמר ביו מלא הרחיבו האומות אלא מדינות.

³ Comp. the explanation or Numb. XXI 30 in Baba Bathra 79a עד מר שתבא אש שאינה צריכה ניפוח.

and where **win** denotes *men*, is to be found in 2 Sam. XXIII 21. Accordingly with only one of the readings exhibited in the Septuagint we obtain the following sense:

We have shot at them,
Heshbon is destroyed even unto Dibon
The women also even unto Nopha
And the men even unto Medeba.

It is probably this reading which underlies the ancient opinion transmitted to us in the Aboth di Rabbi Nathan that only the people were destroyed and not the cities since they took Heshbon to denote inhabitants of that city to harmonise with what follows.

(8) Numb. III 39. — After quoting the passage "all that were numbered of the Levites which Moses and Aaron numbered" the Siphri remarks, it is dotted because Aaron was not of those who numbered. It will be seen that though the Siphri does not specify the word which is thus stigmatized, the reason assigned for the dots indicates beyond the shadow of a doubt that it is אָדְהוֹן and Aaron, which has the points. The dotted word which is thus simply, but unmistakeably indicated in the classical passage before us, is expressly mentioned in the List of the Aboth di Rabbi Nathan. Both in the first and second recensions of this Treatise we are told that it is אָהָר Aaron, which has the points. The cause for the existence of the two redactions of the Biblical MSS., one omitting ואהרן and Aaron, and the other inserting it, is not far to seek. The command to number the Levites was given to Moses alone (Numb. III 14, 15), and in accordance with this command we are told (verse 16) Moses alone effected the numbering. In Numb. IV 41, 45, 46, however, it is stated that Aaron took part in the numbering, whilst in Numb. I 3, 4 he is expressly mentioned in the command to engage with Moses in the numbering of the other tribes. Hence the

two textual recensions, one based upon Numb. III 14, 15 and the other upon Numb. IV 41, 45, 46. The Samaritan and the Syriac which exhibit the MSS. of the former School, omit the word וֹאֹהֹרֹ in accordance with the dots, whilst the Chaldee and the Septuagint follow the latter School and retain ואהרן in the text. We have already referred to the anxiety manifested on the part of some Schools to diminish as much as possible the number of dotted or stigmatized letters. The Midrash in the passage before us affords a striking illustration of this fact. In spite of the explicit statement in the older document the Midrash states that it is simply the Vav conjunctive in ואהרן which is pointed.

(9) Numb. XXIX 15. — In the passage before us the Siphri distinctly declares that the whole word עשרון tenth deal, is dotted and hence is to be elided, because there was only one tenth deal measure in the Sanctuary. This is also the declaration in the List of the second recension of the Aboth di Rabbi Nathan. In the chapter before us the tenth deal measure occurs three times, viz. XXI 4, where it is simply יששרון and a tenth deal; in verse 10, where it is עשרון עשרון reduplicated a several tenth deal, and in the passage here, viz. verse 15, where the MSS. manifestly differed. Some redactions read it here singly in conformity with verse 4, whilst others read it in the reduplicated form in harmony with verse 10. According to the testimony of the Siphri and the Aboth di Rabbi Nathan it is to be read here as in verse 4. The conflicting statements in the later authorities that it is only the Vav plene in ועשרון which is pointed does not account for the inference that there was only one tenth deal measure. in the Sanctuary and is, moreover, due to the anxiety to diminish as much as possible the number of the stigmatized letters.

CHAP. XI.

(10) Deut. XXIX 28. — The Siphri after quoting this verse says that it has the dots and without specifiying where the dots are, remarks that the reason for their being here is to indicate that "when ye shall have performed the things which are revealed I will also disclose to you the things which are concealed". This plainly shows that the dots here referred to are to be on the words ליהוה אלהינו to the Lord our God, and that the words in question are to be elided. When these are cancelled we obtain the sense: "The secret things and the revealed things belong to us and to our children for ever if we do all the words of this Law." That is the secret things or the doctrines which have not as yet been revealed (comp. Deut. XXX 11-14) belong to us and our children or will be disclosed to us if we do all the words of this Law which have been revealed to us. It is remarkable that Rashi already expresses the opinion that the words ליהוה אלהנו to the Lord our God, ought to have been pointed, but that the reverence for the Divine name prevented its being done. 1 Whether it was the reverence for the Divine name or whether it was due to some other recension, it is certain that a later tradition obtained according to which the four words לנו וּלְבַנִינוּ עִד־עוֹלְם to us and to our children for ever, were pointed, or simply the two words לַנוּ וּלבנינוּ to us and to our children. This is exhibited in the first recension of the Aboth di Rabbi Nathan, the Midrash Rabba and in the Massorah. The remark that the Ayin (y) alone of the particle עד unto, is also pointed is manifestly an error since the solitary Daleth (7) which remains of the third word yields no sense and undoubtedly shows that it is the remains of the redaction in which all the four words were dotted. According to the recension in which the four words are stigmatized, the sense of the

¹ Comp. Sanhedrin 13b; Blau, Masoretische Untersuchungen, p. 31.

passage is: "The secret and revealed ways of events are in the hands of the Lord our God to accomplish all the statements of this Law", or according to the redaction which dots the two words: "The secrets and the revealed things are for ever with the Lord our God to fulfil all the words of this Law." It is, however, to be remarked that these later recensions are utterly at variance with the promise deduced from this verse that the secret things belong to us and to our children or will be revealed to us, which these redactors still retain from the older and classical record in the Siphri.

Though the Talmud and the Midrashim do not discuss the four passages which have the extraordinary points in the Prophets and only refer to the one instance in the Hagiographa, viz. Ps. XXVII 13, the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 916 which is the oldest dated MSS., gives the list of the fifteen instances no fewer than three times, and all the other MSS. which I have collated coincide with this ancient recension. In discussing, therefore, the remaining five passages I shall follow the Massoretic Rubric and continue the numeration.

(וו) 2 Sam. XIX 20. — In the supplication of Shimei to the king recorded in this verse, the suppliant as the text now stands, addresses the monarch in the third person let him not impute (אַל־יַחְשָׁב), then suddenly passes over to the second person and do not thou remember (אַל־יִחְשָׁב), and then again as suddenly reverts to the third person when he went out (אַשֶּׁר־יִצְאַ). The dots on this word, therefore, indicate that it is to be cancelled and that אַשָּׁר וֹנָאַא thou wentest out, the second person is to be substituted in accordance with another recension and in harmony with. אול לווע thou remember, which immediately precedes it.

¹ Comp. the Massorah in this Codex on Isa. XLIV 9; Ezek. XLI 20; XLVI 22; and my edition of the Massorah, letter 3, § 521, Vol. II, p. 296.

(12) Isa. XLIV 9. Here הְּבֶּה is dotted and is to be cancelled since it is simply dittography of הם with which the preceding word יְעֵבְיהָם and their witnesses ends. Hence also its absence in the Syriac. Accordingly the passage ought to be rendered:

As for their witnesses they [= the idols] see them not nor know them.

That there was another recension of the text in which more words were stigmatized and elided is evident from the Septuagint where the whole of this sentence וְעֵבֵיהָם is omitted. As the passage is so manifestly defective we may adopt the small alteration suggested by Dr. Blau, viz. to insert the single letter Beth (ב) in the word ועדיהם and their witnesses, and we thus obtain וְעַבְּיִהָם and their worshippers. This yields the appropriate sense:

They that fashion a graven image are all of them vanity Their delectable things shall not profit As for their worshippers they see them not nor know That they [i. e. the worshippers] may be ashamed.

(13) Ezek. XLI 20 where הַהִּיכָּל the temple at the end of the verse is stigmatized, we have another instance of dittography. The Scribe simply wrote it twice, once at the end of this verse and once at the beginning of the next verse. After its elision the last word of this verse (וְקִיר) is to be construed with the first word of the next verse (הַהֵּיכָל) and the passage is to be rendered:

And as for the wall of the temple, the door posts were squared; and as for the face of the Sanctuary &c.

This is the alternative rendering given in the margin of the Revised Version.

(14) Ezek. XLVI 22. — It is now admitted by the best textual critics that the hybrid expression מהַלְצָעוֹת at the

end of this verse which is rendered in the Authorised Version corners (margin cornered) and in the Revised Version in the corners, but which is here stigmatized by the Massorites, is spurious and hence is to be elided. Its absence from the ancient recension is also attested by the Septuagint, the Syriac and the Vulgate. Accordingly the passage is simply to be translated:

these four were of the same measure.

(15) Ps. XXVII 13. — In the Talmud (Berachoth 4a) where the points on x515 are discussed, the following statement is made in the name of R. Jose who flourished in the second century:

It is propounded in the name of R. Jose לולא has dots to indicate that David spoke before the Holy One. blessed be He, Lord of the universe, I believe in Thee that Thou wilt richly reward the righteous in the world to come, but I do not know whether I shall have my portion among them or not.

From the words, therefore, but I do not know, or I do not believe, it is evident that he took the dots to cancel the first part of this expression and that he read it I do not believe. In other recensions, however, the word was entirely elided as is attested by some MSS., the Septuagint, the Syriac and the Vulgate. Accordingly the passage ought to be translated:

I believe that I shall see

The goodness of the Lord in the land of the living.

The italic words *I had fainted*, both in the Authorised Version and in the Revised Version are an exegetical gloss. The words מלמעלה ומלמטה חוץ מן ו"ו שלא or מלמעלה ומלמטה חוץ מן ו"ו שלא מלמטה which are found in some Massoretic Rubrics

ותנא משמיה דרבי יוסי למה נקוד על לולא אמר דוד לפני הק"בה רבונו של עולם מובטח אני בך שאתה משלם שכר טוב לצריקים לעתיד לבוא אבל איני יודע אם יש לי חלק ביניהם ואם לאו.

are a later addition. They do not occur in the oldest recension of this Rubric which is contained in the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 916, nor in the best MSS.

These instances, however, must not be regarded as exhausting the List of spurious words. That there were many more expressions which were thus stigmatized, we incidentally learn from the differences which obtained between the Western and the Eastern Schools of textual critics. Thus we are told in Codex Harley 5710-11 British Museum, that whilst the Westerns have the Kal תנואון to hinder, to dissuade, in the text (= כתיב) in Numb. XXXII 7 and the Hiphil הניאון in the margin (= Keri), the Easterns have תנואון with the Massoretic note on it that the first Vav is dotted. Again on Job XXXIX 15 the Massorah Parva in the Cambridge MS. Add. 465 remarks that the Easterns have dots on the Cheth (ה) and Yod (י) in הית and the beasts of.2 How many more such dotted words may still be found when other MSS. come to light, it is at present impossible to say. The important part of this record is the admission by the Sopherim themselves that the dots on the letters and words mark them as spurious, and that this admission is corroborated by the ancient Versions where some of the stigmatized expressions in question are

actually not represented.

VI. The suspended Letters. — The abnormal appearance of the pendent letters in certain words of the text exhibits another expedient to which the Scribes resorted to record the variations which obtained in the different Schools. Both the Talmud and the Massorah specify four passages in each of which a word has a suspended letter. They are as follows:

י למערבאי תנואון כת' תניאון ק', למרנחאי תנואון נקוד על ו' קדמ' ופילנ. י וחית למדנח' נקוד על חוֹת וווד.

³ Comp. The Massorah, letter &, § 230, Vol. I, p. 37

(1) Judg. XVIII 30. — The history of the suspended Nun (3) in the passage before us is both important and instructive inasmuch as it throws light upon one of the principles by which the Sopherim were guided in the redaction of the Hebrew text. We are told that a wandering young Levite who is afterwards incidentally described as Jonathan the grandson of Moses (Judg. XVII 7 with XXIII 30), became the priest of an idolatrous worship at a salary of ten shekels or twenty-five shillings a year in the house of Micah (XVII 8-13). Five spies of the tribe of Dan are sent to spy out the land for their tribe, and when they enter the house of Micah they recognise Jonathan. After saluting him they craftily entice him to enter into conversation with the chiefs of their army at the entrance of the court (XVIII 1-16). Whilst Jonathan is thus busily engaged in talking, these spies clandestinely enter the upper chamber or chapel and steal the ephod, the teraphim and the images both graven and molten (17-18). Whereupon Jonathan not only sanctions the sacrilegious theft, but accompanies the Danite raiders. The Danites who thus become possessed of the stolen essentials of worship as well as of the officiating priest, establish a regular service and appoint the said "Jonathan the son of Gershom, the son of Moses" and his descendants to the priestly functions in the tribe of Dan (19-31).

That this wandering Levite, this young Jonathan was the actual grandson and not a later descendent of Moses is evident from XX 28 where his contemporary Phineas is admittedly the grandson of Aaron. The two second cousins, therefore, lived about the same time. The fact, however, that the grandson of the great lawgiver should be the first priest of idolatry was considered both degrading to the memory of Moses and humiliating to the national susceptibilities. Hence in accordance with one of

their canons to avoid all cacophony the redactors of the text suspended the letter Nun (1) over the name Moses (משה), thus making it Manasseh. This is admitted by the most distinguished Jewish interpreters. Thus Rashi (1040-1105 A. D.) states: "Because of the honour of Moses was the Nun written so as to alter the name. The Nun, however, is suspended to tell thee that it is not Manasseh, but Moses." This was all the more easily effected since we are told that names were not unfrequently transferred from one individual to another, not because they indicate natural consanguinity or identity of person, but metaphorically to denote similarity of character. Jonathan was called the grandson of Manasseh because he did the deeds of Manasseh the idolatrous king (2 King XXI) and thus belonged to the family of Manasseh. In illustration of this principle the Talmud adduces the following passages:

'He shall lay the foundation thereof in his first-born and in his youngest son shall he set up the gates thereof' [Josh VI 26]; so also it is said: 'In his days [i. e. Ahab's] did Hiel, of the house of Eli, build Jericho' (I Kings XVI 34]. Was not Hiel of the house of Joshaphat and was not Jericho in the territory of Benjamin? Why then is it put on Ahab? It is to indicate that sin is put upon the sinner. Similarly it is said 'and Jonathan, the son of Gershom, the son of Manasseh' [Judg. XVIII 30]. Was he then the son of Manasseh and was he not the son of Moses? And why then is this matter put on Manasseh? It is to indicate that sin is put upon the sinner 2 (Tosephta Sanhedrin XIV 7, 8, p. 437, ed. Zuckermandel, Trier 1882).

For this reason the name of Manasseh has actually been inserted into the text by one School of redactors without mentioning the suspended Nun, though in their

י בן מנשה. מפני כבודו של משה כתב נו"ן לשנות את השם ונכתכה תלויה לזמי שלא היה מנשה אלא משה.

² בבכורו ייםדנה ובצעירו יצים דלתיה וכן הוא אומר בימיו בנה חיאל בית האלי את יריחו והלא חיאל מיהושפט ויריחו משל בנימין ולמה ניתלה באחאב אלא מלמד שתולין חובה בחיב, כיוצא בו ויהונתן בן נרשם בן מנשה וכי בן מנשה הוא והלא בן משה הוא ולמה ניתלה דבר במנשה אלא מלמד שתולין חובה בחייב.

explanations they emphatically declare that it stands for Moses, whilst another School have Moses with the suspended Nun over it.2 It will thus be seen that whether they mention the suspended Nun or not, all the ancient authorities agree that Manasseh (מנשה) stands here for Moses (משה) and that it is so written to spare the reputation of the great lawgiver. This also accounts for the exclusion of Jonathan's name from the family register of Moses given in 1 Chron. XXIII 15, 16 and XXVI 24. Indeed the Chaldee paraphrase asserts that Shebuel (שבאל), which in the passages in question takes the place of Jonathan, is the name given to Jonathan after his conversion from idolatry and returning to the true God שבאל) he returned to the true God). Hence "it is Shebuel that is Jonathan the son of Gershom the son of Moses returned to the fear of the Lord".3 The Septuagint, the Chaldee and the Authorised Version represent the redaction which has מנשה Manasseh in the text, whilst the Vulgate and the Revised Version follow the School which read משה Moses. The early editions are divided. The first edition of the Prophets, Soncino 1485-86; the editio princeps of the entire Bible, Soncino 1488; the third edition of the Bible, Brescia 1494; the Complutensian Polyglot, and the Venice quarto 1521 have מנשה without the suspended Nun, whilst the second edition of the Bible, Naples 1491-93; the Earlier Prophets, Pesaro 1511; the Rabbinic Bible by Felix Pratensis 1517; and the first edition of the Bible

¹ Comp. Baba Bathra 109 b; Aboth di Rabbi Nathan first recension XXXIV, fol. 50 a, ed. Schechter. London 1887; Mechiltha, Pericope יחרוי XVIII I, fol. 57 b, ed. Friedmann, Vienna 1870.

² Jerusalem Berachoth IX, 2; Jerus. Sanhedrin XI, 7; Midrash Rabbaon the Song of Songs II, 5, Wilna 1878; Aboth di Rabbi Nathan second recension XXXVII, fol. 49 b, ed. Schechter.

with the Massorah by Jacob b. Chayim 1524—25 have מנשה with the suspended Nun.

(2) Ps. LXXX 14. — The almost unanimous explanation of this passage by the ancient authorities as recorded in the Talmud and in the Midrashim supply us with the clue to the condition of the primitive text. In its briefest form the explanation is given in the Midrash Rabba on Levit. XI and is as follows:

The Ayin is suspended in to indicate that when Israel is innocent it will only be assailed by the swine of the River, but when it is guilty it will be destroyed by the boar from the forest. The river animal which comes out of the River is weak, whilst the animal which comes from the forest is strong.

In a more expanded form the same explanation is given in the Midrash on the Psalms and on the Song of Songs III 14 as well as in the Aboth di Rabbi Nathan. In the latter the explanation is as follows:

The textual reading (מתיב) is the swine from the River and [the Keri is] the swine from the forest. When Israel does not act in accordance with the will of God, the nations, like the swine of the forest, will be upon them. Just as the boar of the forest kills man and tears animals and plagues the children of man, so all the time that Israel does not act in harmony with the will of God, the nations will kill them, damage them and hurt them. But all the time that the Israelites do the will of God, the nations will not domineer over them no more than the swine of the River. Just as the swine of the River does not kill men nor destroy animals, so all the time that Israel performs His will, no nations nor tongue will kill them, damage them or hurt them. For this reason the textual reading is the swine from the River.²

יכרסְמָנה חזיר מיער עין תלויה אם זכיתם מן היאור ואם לאו מן היער הרא היא ממכיא: "כרסְמָנה חזיר מיער עין תלויה אם מכיא מלקא מן הורשא לית היא ממכיא: Comp. Midrash Rabba Peniope שמיני Parasha XIII, fol. 19a, ed. Wilna 1878.

"יכרסמנה חזיר מיאור כתיב, יכרסמנה חזיר מיער [ק'], שבזמן שאין ישראל בי רבונו של מקום אומות העולם רומות עליהם כחזיר מיער מה חזיר מיער הורג נפשות ומזיק את הבריות ומלקה בני ארם כך כל זמן שאין ישראל עושים רצונו של מקום אומות העולם הורנין בהם ומזיקין בהם ומלקין אותן, וכל זמן שישראל עושים רצונו של מקום אין אומות העולם מושליז בהן כחזיר של יאור מה חזיר של יאור אינו הורג

This leaves it beyond the shadow of a doubt that the twofold reading in question is due to the primitive orthography in which, as we have already seen, both the silent or feeble letters Aleph (x) and Ayin (y) were frequently not expressed 1 The word in question was originally written שיר which one School of textual redactors read מיר from the River, supplying Aleph and the other School read it מיער = מיך from the forest, supplying Ayin. An instance of ינער standing for יער in Phoenician is given by Schröder from the Tucca Inscription.2 This reading מיאר from the River, was the more popular one in Palestine as is evident from other parts of the Talmud, where Ps. LXXX 14 is adduced to prove that חַיָּת קנה the wild beast of the reeds (Ps. LXVIII 31) is identical with the חזיר מיאר the swine of the River.3 The swine of the River like the beast of the reeds is most probably the hippopotamus and is here used as the symbol of Egypt or the empire of the Nilevalley. The comparative harmlessness which these Hagadic interpretations ascribe to this animal is due to the fact that under the Ptolomaic dynasties the Jews enjoyed many privileges, and many of them occupied positions of high rank. It was under the Roman occupation of Palestine and the Roman oppression of the Jews that the alternative reading הויר מיער swine of the forest, became more

נפשות ואינו מויק לבריות כך כל זמן שישראל עושין רצונו אין אומה ולשון הורנין בהז כל מויק לבריות כך כל זמן שישראל עושין רצונו מיאור: Comp. Rabboth di Rabbi Nathan first recension, cap. XXXIV, fol. 50 b, ed. Schechter, London 1887.

popular. The Boar was the military sign of the Roman

¹ Vide supra pp. 138-144.

² Comp. *Die Phönizische Sprache* by Dr. Paul Schröder, p. 19, Halle 1869.

^{3 &#}x27;נער חית קנה געור חיה שדרה בין הקנים דכתיב יכרסמנה (עור חית קנה געור חיה עוד) Pesachim 118 b; Comp. Graetz. Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums. Vol. XXIII, p. 389, Breslau 1874.

legions and though Marius afterwards introduced the Eagle, the Boar still continued as the sign in some legions and especially of the army which was quartered in Palestine. The Romans then became as repulsive to the Jews as the swine and the חויר מיער the Boar, the symbol of Rome not only became the more acceptable reading, but was regarded as identical with the iron yoke of Roman tyranny. Hence the Septuagint, the Chaldee and the Vulgate read the boar out of the wood. As to its treatment in the early editions, the editio princeps of the Hagiographa, Naples 1486-87; the editio princeps of the entire Bible, Soncino 1488; the second edition of the Bible, Naples 1491-93; the third edition of the Bible, Brescia 1494; the Complutensian Polyglot and the three quarto Bomberg editions 1518, 1521, 1525 have simply מיער and take no notice of the suspended letter Ayin. The Salonica edition of the Hagiographa 1515, as far as I can trace it, is the first which exhibits the suspended letter. It is also given in the first edition of the Rabbinic Bible with the Massorah by Jacob b. Chayim Venice 1524-25. It is remarkable that Felix Pratensis in his Rabbinic Bible 1517 makes the Ayin a majuscular letter. This is probably due to the fact that some ancient authorities regarded it as the middle letter of the Psalter.1

(3 and 4) Job XXXVIII 13, 15. — In these two verses the expression רְשִׁעִים wicked, occurs and in both instances the letter Ayin (v) is suspended. Here too the explanation given by the ancient authorities indicates the state of the text. The remark on this passage is as follows:

Why is the Ayin suspended in the word micked? To indicate that if one has become chief upon earth, he will be poor in heaven. In such case the Ayin should not have been written at all? R. Jochanan said it was

¹ Comp. Kiddushim 30 a.

written so as not to offend the dignity of David and R. Eleasar said not to offend the dignity of Nehemiah son of Hachaliah (Sanhedrin 10, 3b).

Whatever may be our opinion as to the value of this homiletic interpretation of the verse before us, there can be no doubt that according to the emphatic statement of these ancient authorities the Ayin (y) originally formed no constituent part of the word in question and that it was afterwards suspended over the word (רשים) out of respect for the two distinguished personages in the Jewish commonwealth. The passages in question, therefore, afford another illustration of the fact that in the primitive orthography the feeble letters were frequently not expressed. Hence some Schools read it סר באשים or באשים poor, or chiefs, whilst in other Schools it was read רְשׁׁיִם = רְשׁׁיִם wicked. The latter is the reading exhibited in all the ancient Versions. As far as I can trace it, Jacob b. Chayim is the first who in the first edition of the Rabbinic Bible with the Massorah, Venice 1524-25, exhibits the suspended Ayin in both verses. The editio princeps of the Hagiographa, Naples 1486 - 87; the first, second, third and fourth editions of the entire Bible (Soncino 1488; Naples 1491-93; Brescia 1494; Pesaro 1511-17), the Salonica edition of the Hagiographa 1515, the Complutensian Polyglot, the first edition of the Rabbinic Bible, by Felix Pratensis 1517 and all the three Venice quartos (1518, 1521, 1525) have the ordinary expressions מולים and without noticing in any way that according to the MSS. and the Massorah the Ayin is suspended in both these words.

VII. The Inverted Nuns. - Other remarkable phenomena exhibited in the Massoretic text are the Inverted

ב מתיב וימנע מרשים אורם וזרוע רמה תשבר מפני מה עי"ין של רשעים תלויה כיון שנעשה אדם רש מלמטה נעשח רש מלמעלה. ולא נכתבה כלל ר' יוחנן ור׳ אליעור חד אמר מפני כבודו של דוד וחד אמר משום כבודו של נחמיה בן חכליה.

Nuns (ג') which the student will find in no fewer than nine passages! and of which he obtains no solution in the margin except the bewildering remark against it An inverted Nun (נון הפוכה) or A separated Nun (נון הפוכה). Yet these inverted letters or their equivalents are also among the earliest signs by which the Sopherim designed to indicate the result of their textual criticism. They are simply intended to take the place of our modern brackets to mark that the passages thus bracketed are transposed.

That this is their original design is attested by the earliest authorities. Thus the Siphra on Numb. X 35 emphatically declares that "these two verses are marked at the beginning and at the end to show that this is not their proper place". Though R. Jehudah the redactor of the Mishna in accordance with the later feelings would not admit that there is any dislocation in the sacred text and hence resorted to the fanciful explanation that the marks in question are designed to show that Numb. X 35, 36 forms a separate book and that the Mosaic Law does not consist of Five, but of Seven Books, yet his father R. Simon b. Gamaliel still maintained the ancient view of dislocation and that the signs denote transposition.2 In the Talmud (Sabbath 115b-116a) where the same ancient view is recorded as the teaching of the Rabbis that the signs indicate dislocation, and where the later opinion of R. Jehudah is also given, the verse "Wisdom hath builded her house, she hath hewn out her seven pillars" in Prov.

¹ Comp. Numb. X 35, 36; Ps. CVII 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 40, and see *The Massorah*, letter 1, § 15, Vol. II, p. 259.

יבי בנסוע הארן נקוד עליו מלמעלי ומלמטה מפני שלא היה זה מקומו רבי אומר מפני שהוא ספר בעצמו מכאן אמרו ספר שנמחק ונשתייר בו פ״ה אותיות כפרשת ויהי בנסוע הארן מטמא את הידים, ר״ש או' נקוד עליו מלמעלה ומלמטה מפני שלא היה זה מקומו: ספרי דבי רב פיסקא פד דף כב.

IX I is adduced 1 to show that the seven pillars denote the Seven Books of the Law which are obtained by taking Numb. X 35, 36 as constituting a separate book. For this makes the book Numbers into three books, viz.: (1) Numb. I 1—X 34; (2) Numb. X 35, 36; and (3) Numb. XI 1—XXXVI 13. Nothing, however, can be more emphatic than the declaration of R. Simon b. Gamaliel who in accordance with the ancient view adds in the passage before us that "in future this Section, viz. Numb. X 35, 36, will be removed from here and be written in its proper place".2 Its proper place, according to a later Talmudist, is in the description of the journeys and encampment of the tribes. The two verses belong to the journey of the Levites with the tabernacle and ought to follow immediately after Numb. II 17.3 That the Inverted Nuns indicate here a dislocation of the text is also attested by the Septuagint. In the recension from which this Version was made, verses 35, 36 preceded verse 34, so that the order of the verses in question is Numb. X 35, 36, 34 and this seems to be the

The other seven *Inverted Nuns* are confined to Ps. CVII. They bracket verses 23—28 and verse 39. But though the best MSS. and the Massorah distinctly mark the verses in question with the sign of dislocation, neither the Talmudic authorities nor the ancient Versions give us any indication as to where the proper place is for the bracketed

proper place for the two verses.

י תנו רבנן ויהי בנסע הארן ויאמר משה פרשה זו עשה לה הק"בה סימניות מלמעלה ומלמטה לומר שאין זה מקומה, רבי אומר לא מן השם הוא זה אלא מפני שספר חשוב הוא מפני עצמו, כמאן אולא הא דאמר ר' שמואל בר נחמן א"ר יונתן חצבה עמודיה שבעה אלו שבעה ספרי תורה: שבת דף טו.

דף קטז ואבות דרבי נתן נוסחא א פרק לד דף נ.
³ Comp. Sopherim VI, 1; Geiger, Jüdische Zeitschrift für Wissenschaft

und Leben, Vol. III, p. 80-82, Breslau 1864-65.

sections. The Talmud which notices the fact that this Psalm has the signs, simply explains it homiletically. It says that "verse 23 &c. is furnished with signs like the particles of exception but and only in the Bible to indicate that the prayer of those who are in danger of shipwreck is only heard before the event is decreed by God, but is not heard after it has been decreed". This is in accordance with the sentiments of the later Rabbins who, as we have often seen, manifested the greatest anxiety to obliterate altogether, or to diminish as much as possible any indication that there are spurious words or letters in the text or that any of the sections are dislocated. Hence they explained away allegorically all the critical signs of the ancient redactors of the text.

But though it is now difficult to say to what part of the Psalm the magnificent description of the sea-voyage belongs, it is comparatively easy to rearrange the passage in which the dislocation is indicated towards the end of the Psalm. As the text now stands the transition from verse 38 to 39 is inexplicable. The verses exhibit no logical sequence and verse 39 is without a subject. If, however, we avail ourselves of the critical indication given us by the ancient redactors that the verse before us is dislocated and put verse 40 before verse 39 we not only obtain a logical order, but have the missing subject for verse 39. We have thus

Verse 40: He poureth contempt upon princes,

And causeth them to wander in the pathless waste.

- 39: And they are diminished and bowed down Through oppression trouble snd sorrow;
- " 41: But he setteth the needy secure from affliction,

 And maketh like a flock the families [of the afflicted].

It must, however, not be supposed that the nine passages tabulated in the Massoretic Rubric as bracketed exhaust all the instances comprised in this category of critical remarks. We incidentally know from the Massorah Parva on Gen. XI 32 in the editio princeps of the Rabbinic Bible with the Massorah by Jacob b. Chayim Venice 1524—25 that there is also an Inverted Nun at the end of the chapters in question. This indicates that the death of Terah which is recorded in the last verse does not chronologically come before the Lord's command to Abraham to leave Haran with which chapter twelve begins and that it must have taken place after the departure of the patriarch. The verse in question must, therefore, be transposed.

The treatment which these Inverted Nuns has received on the part of some of the later Massorites affords another striking illustration of the anxiety to obliterate all the early traces of critical signs as to the condition of the text. Instead of placing these brackets at the beginning and at the end of the verses which they are designed to indicate as dislocated, in accordance with nearly all the best Codices, some MSS. exhibit the inverted Nun in a word in the text itself which contains this letter in each of the nine passages. This curious device I have given in the Massorah.²

VIII. The Removal of Indelicate Expressions, Anthropomorphisms &c. from the Text. — Hitherto we have traced the phenomenal signs furnished in the text by the Sopherim themselves as indications of various readings which obtained in the Codices of the different Schools. These abnormal

¹ Comp. Geiger, Jüdische Zeitschrift für Wissenschaft und Leben, Vol. 1, p. 120, Breslau 1862.

² Comp. The Massorah letter 3, § 15a, Vol. II, p. 259.

appearances of the text though plain enough to decipher with the clue which the ancient records supply us, have yet evoked a difference of opinion on the part of some modern critics because later Talmudists allegorised or homiletically explained what was primarily intended as textual criticism. No such difference of opinion, however, can possibly be entertained about the statement made by the redactors of the text with regard to the principles by which they were guided in the work of redaction. The classical passage which sets forth these principles is as follows:

In every passage where the text has an indelicate expression a euphemism is to be substituted for it, as for instance for שעלנה "ravish, violate, outrage" [Deut. XXVIII 30; Isa. XIII 16; Jerem. III 2; Zech. XIV 2] שעכנה to lie with, is to be substituted; for עפלים posteriors [Deut. XXVIII 27; I Sam. V 6; VI 4] read שורום emerods; for חריונים doves' dung [2 Kings VI 25] read חרי יונים decayed leaves; for חראיהם or excrement [2 Kings XVIII 27; Isa. XXXVI 12] substitute deposit; for שיניהם urine [2 Kings XVIII 27; Isa. XXXVI 12] read צואה water of the feet; for למוצאות decayed leaves למוצאות severs, retreats.¹ Comp. Megilla 25b; Jerusalem Megilla IV.

In accordance with this rule not only does the Massorah duly register these stigmatized expressions,² but all the MSS. of the Bible with the Massorah and every edition of the Massoretic text give in every instance the authoritative substitute as the official reading in the margin and furnish the consonants of the text itself with the vowel-signs which belong to the marginal reading. These, however, are simply typical examples and we shall see in the sequel that this principle was applied by the authori-

תנו רבנן כל המקראות הכתובין בתורה לנגאי קורין אותן לשבח כנון ישגלנה ישכבנה בעפלים במחרים חריונים דביונים לאכול את חוריהם ולשתות את ממי שניהם לאכול צואתם ולשתות את מימי רגליהם למחראות למוצאות: מגלה כה.

² Comp. The Massorah, letter v, § 722, Vol. II, 416; letter v, § 138, Vol. II, p. 607.

tative redactors of the Sacred Scriptures far more extensively to remove indelicate expressions and antropomorphisms.

IX. The Emendations of the Sopherim. — The editorial principle thus laid down that indelicate expressions and anthropomorphisms are to be removed is also illustrated in the examples which the Sopherim have given of the passages altered in harmony with this canon. In the best MSS. there are remarks in the margin against certain readings calling attention to the fact that they exhibit "an emendation of the Sopherim". Thus in the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 916 which is the oldest dated MS. known at present, the Massorah Parva notices it in four different places. On Ezek. VIII 17 it states that it is "one of the eighteen emendations of the Sopherim".1 On Zech. II 12 the remark is somewhat different in form, but the same in purport and is as follows: "one of the eighteen emendations of the Sopherim, the sages, their memory is for good and for a blessing"; whilst on Mal. I 13 and III 8 the Massoretic remark is the same as in the first instance. In two of these four passages the Massorah Magna gives the complete List of these eighteen alterations, viz. Ezek. VIII 17 and Zech. II 12. But though the Massoretic List gives the passages as emended, it does not state what the original text was which the Sopherim altered. Apart from the Massorah we possess no fewer than four separate and independent records which chronicle this important fact, and which illustrate it by adducing the passages wherein the alterations have been made. The variations in the number of the illustrations and the difference in the order in which the instances are adduced

¹ מן י״ח תיקון סופרים.

show that the records in question are independent of each other and that they are derived from different sources.

The oldest record of these alterations is given in the Mechiltha on Exod. XV 7 and is as follows:

- (1) Zech. II 12 (A. V. v. 8): "For he that toucheth you toucheth the apple of his eye," but the text is altered. So also
- (2) Mal. I 13: "Ye said also, Behold what a weariness is it! and ye have snuffed at it," but the text is altered. So also
- (3) I Sam. III 13: "For the iniquity which he knoweth, because his sons made themselves accursed," but the text is altered. So also
- (4) Job. VII 20: "Why hast thou set me as a mark against thee so that I am a burden to myself"? the text is altered. So also
- (5) Habak. I 10: "Art thou not from everlasting O Lord my God, mine Holy One? we shall not die," the text is altered. So also
- (6) Jerem. II II: "Hath a nation changed their gods which yet are no gods? but my people have changed their glory," the text is altered. So also
- (7) Ps. CVI 20: "Thus they have changed their glory into the similitude of an ox," the text is altered.
- (8) Numb. XI 15: "And Let me not see my wretchedness" the text is altered. So also
- (9) 2 Sam. XX 1: "We have no portion in David every man to his tents O Israel"? the text is altered.
- (10) Ezek. VIII 17: "And lo, they put the branch to their nose," the text is altered.
- (11) Numb. XII 12: "When he cometh out of his mother's womb" should be our mother's, the text is altered. Mechiltha 39a, ed. Friedmann, Vienna 1870.

י והנוגע בהם כנוגע בבבת עינו רבי יהודה אומר בבבת עין אינו אומר אלא בבבת עינו כתיב כביכול כלפי מעלה אלא שכינה הכתוב: כיוצא בו ואמרתם הנה מתלאה והפכתם אותו אלא שכינה הכתוב: כיוצא בו בעון אשר ידע כי מקללים להם ונו' אלא שכינה הכתוב: כיוצא בו למה שמתני למפגע לך ואהיה עלי למשא כינה הכתוב: כיוצא בו הלא אתה מלכי מקדם יי' אלהים ולא נמות כינה הכתוב: כיוצא בו ההמיר נו' אלהים והמה לא אלהים ועמי המיר כבודו כינה הכתוב: כיוצא בו וימירו את כבודם בתבנית שור כינה הכתוב: ואל אראה ברעתי כינה הכתוב: כיוצא בו אין לנו חלק בדוד [ונו'] איש לאהליו ישראל כינה הכתוב: והגם שולחים הזמורה אל אפם כינה הכתוב: בצאתו מרחם אמו הרחם אמנו היה לו לומר כינה הכתוב: אף כאן אתה אומר הנוגע בו כנוגע בבבת עינו כביכול כלפי מעלה הכתוב מדבר אלא שכינה הכתוב: מפר מכילתא דף לט.

In the Siphre (fol. 22 b; ed. Friedmann, Vienna 1864), where the same fact is recorded, only seven of the instances are adduced, since Nos. 2, 3, 7 and 9 which are given in the Mechiltha List are here omitted. For completeness sake I subjoin the text of the Siphri in the note.1 It is also important to notice that the order in which the passages are enumerated differs in the two documents.

The third record is contained in the Yalkut Shimeoni on Exod. XV 7, § 247, p. 151, ed. Warsaw 1876. Though the List here given contains ten passages and might thus be almost considered identical with that given in the first record, a close examination of it will show its independence.2

It is the fourth record, given in the Midrash Tanchuma also on Exod. XV 7 (p. 83 a, ed. Wilna 1833) which is of the utmost importance in the discussion of the alterations of the Sopherim. The List in this document not only contains six more instances, viz. Gen. XVIII 22; 2 Sam. XVI 12; Hos. 10 7; Job. XXXII 3; Lament. III 20;

י כל הנונע בהם כנגע בבבת עינו כבת עין לא נאמר אלא בבבת עינו של מקום כביכול כלפי מעלה אלא שכינה הכתוב: כיוצא בו למה שמתני למפגע לך ואהיה עלי למשא אלא שכינה הכתו': כיוצא בו והנה שולחים את הזמורה אל אפם אלא שכינה הכתוב: כיוצא בו הלא אתה מקדם ה' אלהי קדושי ולא אמות אלא שכינה הכתוב: כיוצא בו וימירו את כבודם בתבנית שור אוכל עשב אלא שכינה הכתוב: כיוצא בו ואם ככה את עושה לי הרגני נא הרוג אם מצאתי חן בעיניך ואל אראה ברעתי אלא שכינה הכתוב: כיוצא בו אשר בצאתו מרחם אמו ויאכל חצי בשרו אלא שכינה הכתוב: ספרי דף כב. 2 כי הנוגע בכם נוגע בבבת עינו ר' יהודה אומר בבבת עין אינו אומר אלא בבבת עינו כביכול כלפי מעלה הכתוב מדבר אלא שכנה הכתוב: כיוצא בו אתה אומר ואמרתם הנה מתלאה והפכתם אותו אלא שכנה הכתוב: כיוצא כו אתה אומר בעון אשר ירע כי מקללים להם אלא שכנה הכתוב: כיוצא בו אתה אומר הלא אתה הוא מקדם ה' אלהי קרושי לא נמות אלא שכנה הכתוב: כיוצא בו ההימיר גוי אלהים וגו' אלא שכנה הכתוב: כיוצא בו וימירו את כבודם וגו' אלא שכנה הכתוב: כיוצא בו אין לנו חלק בדוד ונו' אלא שכנה הכתוב: כיוצא בו אשר בצאתו מרחם אמו ונו' אלא שכנה הכתוב: כיוצא בו והנה שולחים את הומורה אל אפם אלא שכינה הכתוב: אף כאן אתה אומר כי (כל) הנוגע בכם וכו': ילקוט שמעוני חלק א פרשת בשלח דף עו, פ רמו.

² Chron. X 16, but gives the original text in eleven out of the seventeen passages which it adduces and emphatically declares that the primitive readings were altered by the Members of the Great Synagogue or the Spiritual authorities who fixed the canon of the Hebrew Scriptures.¹

For the completion of the materials relating to this important branch of textual criticism and before discussing the merits of these alterations we have yet to mention the fact that the Massorah itself gives us a List of these alterations of the Sopherim with the original reading in every passage. The List is preserved in the following three of the Yemen MSS. in the British Museum; Orient. 1379, fol. 268 b; Orient. 2349, fol. 108 a; and Orient. 2365, fol. 138 b. In all the three MSS. the Massorah in question is given on Numb. XII 2. In Orient. 1397 and Orient. 2349 these alterations are not only ascribed to the Sopherim, but it is declared that according to the opinion of some Schools they were made by Ezra himself. As I have printed this

יוכן הוא אומר כי הנוגע בכם נוגע בבבת עינו עיני היה לו לומר אלא שכנהו הכתוב כלומר כביכול כלפי מעלן וכנהו הכתוב שהוא תיקון סופרים אנשי כנסת הגדולה: כיוצא בו ואמרתם הנה מתלאה והפכתם אותי אלא שכנהו הכתוב: כיוצא בו בעון אשר ידע כי מקללים להם בניו ולא כהה בם אלא שכנהו הכתוב: כיוצא בו למה שמתני למפגע לך ואהיה עָלֶיךּ למשא אלא שכנהו הכתוב: כיוצא בו הלא אתה מקדם ה' אלהי קרושי לא ימות אלא שכנהו הכתוב: כיוצא בו ההמיר גוי אלהים והמה לא אלהים ועמי המיר כבודי בלא יועיל אלא שכנהו הכתוב: כיוצא בו וימירו את פבודי בתבנית שור אוכל עש אלא שכנהו הכתוב: כיוצא בו בבודי בקלון אמיר אלא שכנהו הכתוב: כיוצא בו ובשלשת רעיו חרה אפו על אשר לא מצאו מענה וירשיעו את איוב אלא שכנהו הכתוב: כיוצא בו ואברהם עורנו עומד לפני ה' אלא שכנהו הכתוב: כיוצא בו ואם ככה אתה עושה לי הרגני נא הרוג אם מצאתי חן בעיניך ואל אראה ברעתי: כיוצא בו אל נא תהי כמת אשר בצאתו מרחם אמנו ויאכל חצי בשרנו אלא שכנהו הכתוב: כיוצא בו מה לנו חלק בדוד ולא נחלה בבן ישי איש לאהליך ישראל עחה ראה ביתד דוד וילד ישראל לאהליו: ובדברי הימים לאלהיו: זכור תזכור ותשוח עלי נפשי: אולי יראה ה' בעיניו אלא שכינו פסוקים אלו אנשי כנסת הגדולה: ולכד נקראו סופרים שהיו סופרים כל אותיות שבתורה ודורשין אותו: וכן והנם שולחים את הזמורה אל אפי והם תקנו אל אפם: ואף כאן כי הנוגע בכם נוגע בבבת עֵינָי: מדרש תנחומא פרשת בשלח דף פנ: ווילנא שנת תקצ"ג. List in the Massorah¹ it is unnecessary to reproduce it here. I must also mention that a List of these Alterations with the original readings has been preserved in Orient. 1425 which contains the MS. of the Hebrew Grammar called Maase Ephod by Prophiat Duran. In the heading (fol. 114b) the List is described as exhibiting the alterations made by Ezra and Nehemiah.² As it gives only fifteen instances and does not mention any number, it is evident that it emanates from a source prior to the Massoretic recension when the number was already fixed. In the excellent edition of this valuable work published by Friedländer and Kohn, Vienna 1865, the List is not given probably because it was not in the MSS. which these learned editors collated.

It will be seen that in none of the documents in which these alterations are enumerated is any definite order followed in the respective instances adduced. The

1 Comp. The Massorah, letter II, § 206, Vol. II, p. 710.

² תקון סופרים עזרא ונחמיה

ואברהם עודנו עומד לפני י"י וי"י עומר לפני היה כתוב ואל אראה ברעתי ברעתך היה כתו׳ מרחם אמנו היה כתו" מרחם אמו כי מקללים להם בניו לו היה כתו" איש לאהליו ישראל איש לאלהיו היה בתו׳ ועמי המיר כבודו כבודי היה כתו׳ הזמורה אל אפם אל אפי היה כתו׳ עיני היה כתו׳ הנוגע בהם נוגע בבבת עיניו ואתם מחללים אותו אותי היה כתו׳ אותי היה כתו׳ והפכתם אותו עליך היה כתו׳ ואהיה עלי למשא אולי יראה י"י בעיני בעיניו היה בתו' ותשוח עלי נפשי נפשו היה כתו" ויאכל חצי בשרו בשרנו היה כתו׳ שם שמים היה כתו' וירשיעו את איוב

תם תקון סופרים.

List in each of the records has a sequence of its own. For the convenience of the student, however, I shall discuss the passages in the order in which they occur in the Hebrew Bible.

(1) Gen. XVIII 22. — "But Abraham stood yet before the Lord." Of the Lists in the four records, the Tanchuma List is the only one which adduces this passage as exhibiting an alteration of the Sopherim. It is also given in both Lists of the oldest Massorah 1 contained in the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 916 and in all the three Massoretic Rubrics in Orient. 1379, Orient. 2349 and Orient. 2365 in each of which it is emphatically stated that it ought to be, or that the original reading was "but the Lord stood yet before Abraham" only that the text was altered.2 To the same effect, but in somewhat simpler language is the declaration in the ancient List preserved in the Maase Ephod that the text was originally and the Lord still stood before Abraham, but that it was altered by Ezra and Nehemiah into its present from. With such an emphatic declaration before us, both in the ancient post-Biblical records and in the Massorah itself, it seems almost superfluous to point out that it would be most incomprehensible for the redactors of the text to state that they have here altered the text and also to give the original reading when they had in fact done no such thing. The context, moreover, and the logical continuity of the narrative show beyond doubt that the primitive text was what the Sopherim and the Massorah state it to have been. It was the Lord who came down to see and to tell Abraham whether the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah had acted in accordance with the bitter cry which went up to

י Comp. the St. Petersburg Codex Ezek, VIII 17 and Zech. II 12.

heaven; it was the Lord, therefore, who stood before Abraham; it was to the Lord's immediate presence that Abraham drew nigh, and it was the Lord who departed from Abraham when the patriach left off interceding with Him (Gen. XVIII 21, 22, 33). As the phrase to stand before another is sometimes used in the Scriptures to denote a state of inferiority and homage it was deemed derogatory to the Deity to say that the Lord stood before Abraham, Hence in accordance with the above rule to remove all indelicate expressions the phrase was altered by the Sopherim.

- (2) Numb. XI 15. All the four ancient records and the Massoretic Lists give this passage as exhibiting an alteration of the Sopherim. The three Yemen MSS. and the Massorah preserved in the Maase Ephod state the text originally was "kill me I pray thee out of hand if I have found favour in thy sight that I may not see (ברעתך) thy evil", i. e. the evil or punishment wherewith thou wilt visit Israel. As this might be so construed as to ascribe evil to the Lord, the Sopherim altered it into "that I may not see (ברעתי) my evil," which the Authorised Version and the Revised Version render "my wretchedness". From the rendering of the Jerusalem Targum "that I may not see the evil of thy people" it is evident that in some Schools the textual reading was ברעתם or ברעתם.2
- (3) Numb. XII 12. "Let her not, I pray, be as the dead born child which when it comes out of its mother's womb, has half its flesh consumed." This we are told by all the ancient authorities is a correction of the Sopherim and that the text originally was: "Let her not, I pray, be as the dead born child, which when proceeding from our

¹ Comp. Gen. XVIII 8; XLI 16; Deut. I 38; X 8; XVIII 7 &c. יולא אחמי בבישתהון דעמך.

mother's (אָמֵנוּ) womb the half of our flesh (בְּשֶׂרֵנוּ) is consumed." This was regarded as derogatory to the mother of the great lawgiver by depicting her as having given birth to a partially decomposed body. The simile was, therefore,

altered from the first person plural into the impersonal.

(4) I Sam. III 13. — "Because his sons did bring a curse upon themselves and he restrained them not" or as the Authorised Version has it "because his sons made themselves vile" margin "accursed". It is now admitted that this rendering cannot legitimately be obtained from the text as it now stands since the Piel קלל does not mean to bring a curse upon any one, but to curse and is never followed by the dative, but the accusative. All the ancient authorities, however, emphatically declare that this is not the original reading, and that the text exhibits one of the alterations of the Sopherim. According to some authorities, the text originally was מקללים לי they cursed me, i. e. God. But though this undoubtedly yields the original sense and supplies the reason for the alteration, it is exposed to the same grammatical difficulty as the present is never construed with the dative. There can, therefore, be no doubt that the Septuagint has preserved the original reading אַלהִים God, viz. "because his sons cursed God" (comp. Exod. XXII 27), which is also exhibited in the margin of the Revised Version and is now accepted by the best critics. In their effort to soften the offensive statement that the sons of Eli openly blasphemed God, and that he did not reprimand them the Sopherim were most anxious to alter the text as little as possible. They, therefore, restricted themselves to the simple omission of the two letters Aleph (x) and Yod (') and indeed of only the one letter Aleph since the Yod, as we have seen, was frequently absent in the primitive orthography thus converting אלהם God into להם them.

(5) 2 Sam. XVI 12. — Before considering the alteration which the Sopherim introduced into this passage it is necessary to remark that the text here exhibits three different recensions. We have in the first place the textual reading or the Kethiv "the Lord will look (בעוני) on mine iniquity", which is interpreted "the iniquity" or "wrong done unto me" and which is adopted in the Revised Version. Then we have the official Keri "the Lord will look (בעיני) on mine eye", which is explained to stand for "my tears" and which is followed in the margin of the Authorised Version. And then again we have the reading "the Lord will look on my affliction", which is exhibited in the Septuagint, the Syriac and the Vulgate, and which is followed in the text of the Authorised Version, and is noticed in the margin of the Revised Version. It will be seen that in both the textual reading or Kethiv (בַּעוֹנִי) on mine iniquity, and the official reading or Keri (בעיני) on mine eye, we have to resort to artificial explanations to obtain a tolerable sense. In the first instance we are told that "mine iniquity" stands for the iniquity or wrong done to me and in the second instance it is stated that "mine eye" stands for my tears. The ancient authorities, however, emphatically declare that the passage before us exhibits an alteration of the Sopherim and that the text originally was "the Lord will behold (בעינו) with his eye". In harmony with the recensional canon that anthropomorphisms are to be removed, the reading that the Lord will see with his own eye was altered by the simple process of substiting the letter Yod (1) for Vav (1) at the end of the word thus converting the suffix third person into the first person.

(6, 7 and 8) 2 Sam. XX 1. — "Every man to his tents, O Israel" we are told in the Mechiltha, which contains the earliest record on this subject, that this is not the original

reading, but that it exhibits an alteration of the Sopherim. Originally the text read "every one to his gods, O Israel". The rebellion against the house of David was regarded as necessarily involving apostasy from the true God and going over to idolatry. It was looked upon as leaving God and the Sanctuary for the worship of idols in tents. But this impudent challenge of Biehri the man of Belial was regarded as a contemptuous defiance of, and derogatory to the God of Israel which apparently escaped with impunity. Hence the Sopherim transposed the two middle letters of the word and לאהלין to his gods, became לאהלין to his tents. For this reason the ancient authorities tell us the expression in question was also altered in the same phrase in 1 Kings XII 16 and 2 Chron. X 16 which record a similar event.

(9) Jerem. II 11. — The ancient records emphatically declare that the original reading here was: "but my people hath changed (ככודי) my glory", and that the Sopherim altered it into: "but my people hath changed (בבודו) his glory. The same reverend motive which underlies the alteration with regard to the name of God in the preceding passage determined the change here. The expression [5] glory, was considered to denote the visible manifestation of the Deity, i. e. the Shechinah. To say, therefore, that the Israelites changed this Supreme Glory for an idol was deemed too bold a statement and derogatory to the Lord. Hence the alteration of the suffix first person to the third person which was easily effected by the substitution of the Vav (1) for the Yod (1). And though "his glory" may also refer to the Lord yet it leaves room for a divergence of opinion and at all events removes the harshness of the sentence. The ancient Versions exhibit this alteration of the Sopherim which is also followed both in the Authorised Version and in the Revised Version.

- (10) Ezek. VIII 17. "And lo, they put the branch to (DDN) their nose", we are told by all the ancient authorities is a correction of the Sopherim and that it was originally: "and lo, they put the branch to ('Ex) my nose", i. e. face. To understand the alteration here effected it is necessary to examine the context. The Lord here enumerates the great abominations which the house of Judah has committed in His very Sanctuary. He states that they have not only profaned His altar by introducing the idolatrous sun-worship into the Temple of the Lord, "but still further to provoke me to anger they scornfully display the branch which is used as an emblem in this abominable worship into (אָפּי) my very nostrils". This bold anthropomorphism was afterwards regarded as derogatory to the supreme Deity and hence in accordance with the prescribed canon was altered by the Sopherim.
- (וו) Hosea IV 7. "I will change their glory into shame" exhibits another alteration of the Sopherim. The ancient authorities state that the original reading here was "קבוֹן my glory, instead of בְּבוֹן their glory. But it is evident from the context that this only exhibits partially the alteration which the Sopherim introduced here, since "I will change my glory into shame" is both against the context and against the principle which underlies these alterations. There can, therefore, be no doubt that the alteration also included the verb which as the Mechiltha rightly points out was originally הַמִּירוֹ or הַמִּירוֹ or הַמִּירוֹ future first person, i. e. they have changed, instead of future first person singular, i. e. I will change. Accordingly the text originally read:

My glory they have changed into shame

which the Sopherim altered into:

Their glory I will change into shame.

This is in perfect harmony with the alteration recorded in No. o.

(12) Hab. I 12. — "Art thou not from everlasting, O Lord my God, mine Holy One? we shall not die." All the ancient records emphatically state that this exhibits the corrected text by the Sopherim and that the original reading was:

Art thou not from everlasting?
O Lord my God, mine Holy One, thou diest not.

The parallelism plainly shows that this is the correct reading. The address in both clauses is to the Lord who is described in the first clause as being from everlasting and in the second clause as never dying or enduring for ever. The introduction, therefore, of a new subject in the plural with the predicate "we shall not die" thus ascribing immortality to the people is contrary to the scope of the passage. Not only has the Chaldee preserved the original reading by paraphrasing it "thy word endureth for ever",1 but Rashi (1040-1105) makes it the basis of his explanation. "The prophet says why art thou silent to all this. Art thou not from everlasting my God, mine Holy One, who diest not."2 It is very remarkable that the Revised Version which has not noticed any other of the alterations of the Sopherim has the following note in the margin on this passage: "according to an ancient Jewish tradition thou diest not". The reason for the alteration is not far to seek. It was considered offensive to predicate of the Lord "thou diest not". Hence "we shall not die" was substituted.

ו מימרך קיים לעלמין.

² אמר הנביא ואתה למה תחריש לכל זאת הלא אתה מקדם אלהי קדושי אשר לא תמות וזה שכתוב לא נמות אחד מתיקוני סופרים שבמקרא הוא שכינה הכתו' וכן והבחתם אותו וכן הרבה המפורשים בסיפרי, ולפי תיקון הסופרים זהו פירושו הלא אתה אלהי מקדם קדושי אל תתנני למות בידו.

(נְיָנִי The Hebrew II 8 in the Authorised Version. — Here the original reading, which was: "he that toucheth you toucheth the apple of (עִינִי) my eye", has been altered by the Sopherim into: "he that toucheth you toucheth the apple of (עִינִי) his eye", i. e. as if one were to touch the apple of his own eye. Though "the eye of the Lord" is not unfrequently used in the Bible¹ yet "the apple of my eye" (בְּבַרְּתְ עִינִי) occurs no where else. It was, therefore, regarded derogatory to the Deity that he himself should ascribe to himself so pronounced an anthropomorphatic feature. Hence in accordance with the rule which underlies these alterations the Yod (') was changed into Vav (') as in the case of the alteration exhibited in No. 9.

(14) Malachi I 13. — All the ancient authorities emphatically declare that the original reading here was: "ye have snuffed (אוֹתוֹי) at me", and that the Sopherim have altered it into: "ye have snuffed (וֹתוֹי) at it", because it was regarded derogatory to the Lord to apply to him such an offensive predicate. That the text had originally at me is, moreover, attested by Rashi who plainly says: "this is one of the eighteen alterations of the Sopherim. The textual reading ווֹתוֹי at me, but the passage was altered and they [i. e.

י Comp. Ps XXXIII 18 with Jerem. XXIV 6; Ezek. V II; VII 4 &c.

2 In Deut. XXXII 10 the phrase is not exactly the same since it is here אמון עינו which is also translated as the apple of his eye. There was no necessity for any alteration here because the expression does not necessarily refer to God. The passage may mean God kept Israel as one keeps the apple of his eye. The Septuagint, the Jerusalem Targum and the Syriac omit the article altogether, i. e. he kept Israel as the eye-apple, whilst Onkelos, who translates the passage in the plural, renders the suffix also in the plural, i. e. he kept them as the apple of their eye. Comp. Geiger, Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel, p. 324, Breslau 1857.

the Sopherim] substituted for it אותו at it". St. Jerome must also have known this fact since he thinks that we might read אותי at me,² and indeed this reading is found in many MSS.

- (נבוֹדָם) their glory." This we are told exhibits one of the alterations of the Sopherim. The original reading was: "they changed (בְּבוֹדִי) my glory", but it was altered because the statement that the Israelites changed God's visible Shechinah for the image of an ox was deemed derogatory to the Divine Being. The reason, therefore, which underlies this alteration is exactly the same which induced the changes in the passages marked Nos. 9 and 11. It is to be remarked that both some MSS. of the Septuagint and the Vulgate exhibit the reading this glory, in the third person, i. e. God's glory or Shechinah.
- (16) Job. VII 20. According to the testimony of the ancient records the original reading of this passage was:

Why hast thou set me as a mark for thee And why have I become a burden unto thee?

This reading is still preserved in the Septuagint and is demanded by the parallelism and the context. The declaration, however, on the part of Job that he had become a burden to God was considered by the redactors of the text as bordering on blasphemy. Hence the Sopherim altered מליך unto thee, into עליך unto myself, by the simple process of omitting the single letter Caph (ק). Ibn Ezra (1088—1177) one of the most distinguished Jewish commentators of the middle ages boldly declares that "though

י זו אחת מי"ח תיבו' של תיקון סופרי'. הפחתם אותו אותי נכתב אלא שכינה הכתו' וכתבו אותו.

³ Ut in Hebraeo legi potest, et exsufflastis me, haec dicendo, non sacrificio, sed mihi cui sacrificabatis, fecistis injuriam. Comp. the article on the *Tikun Sopherim* by the Rev. Oliver Turnbull Crane in the *Hebraica*, Vol. III, p. 243, 1887.

unto myself is an alteration of the Sopherim neverthless in explaining the passage it is best to ignore this alteration". 1

(מְּלְּהִים) Job. XXXII 3. — "And yet they had condemned (מְלּהִים) Job", exhibits an alteration of the Sopherim. According to the List of these alterations preserved in the Maase Ephod the text originally was "and because they had condemned (מֵּלְהִים) God." The context shows that the original reading is preferable to the emendation. Job's three friends came to prove that God's providential dealings towards the afflicted patriarch were perfectly just, inasmuch as his sufferings were the merited punishment for his sinful life. But instead of vindicating the Divine justice they ceased to answer Job because he was right in their eyes (מֵלִינִיהָם as the Septuagint rightly has it) and they thereby inculpated the conduct of God. The expression, however, "and they condemned God" was considered blasphemous and hence Job was substituted for God.

(וַפָּשָׁי) is humbled in me," according to the testimony of the ancient authorities and the Massorah is another alteration of the Sopherim. The original reading was: "and (בְּפִשָּׁין) thy soul will mourn over me" or "will condescend unto me". The most cursory examination of the context will disclose the fact that the original reading restores the logical sequence, the true rhythm and the pathetic beauty of the text. We need only read the three verses together which form the stanza to see it:

Verse 19: Remember my misery and my forlorn state the wormwood and the gall.

- " 20: Yea verily thou wilt remember and thy soul will mourn over me.
- , 21: This I recall to my heart, therefore, I have hope

The expression, however, "thy soul (בְּפָשֶׁר) will mourn" as applied to God, was considered an offensive anthropomorphism and, therefore, the Sopherim in harmony with the rule which underlies all these corrections, altered it into my soul (בְּפִשִׁי) and thus marred the beauty and pathos of the stanza.

362

These passages, however, are simply quoted as typical instances and are by no means intended to be exhaustive. Hence none of the above named ancient documents specify the exact number of the Sopheric alterations, but simply adduce sundry examples to illustrate the principle that indecent and anthropomorphatic expressions are to be altered by the authoritative redactors of the text. Hence too the different records vary in the number of the examples which they respectively quote. The Siphri adduces seven passages, the Yalkut ten, the Mechiltha eleven and the Tanchuma seventeen passages. That there were other passages in which identically the same or similar phrases occurred in the primitive text and that they too underwent the same process of alteration in accordance with the canon to remove indelicate and improper expressions will be seen from the following considerations.

The oldest Massorah in the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 916, which registers these alterations of the Sopherim, adds two more examples which are not given in any of the ancient documents. And though the catchwords are simply given without mentioning what the original reading was which the Sopherim altered, there is no difficulty in ascertaining it by the light of the other Sopheric alteration and by bearing in mind the principle which underlies these changes.

The catchword for the first change is מחללים = Malachi I 12. This indicates that originally the text was: "ye have polluted me" (comp. Ezek. XIII 19), and that אוֹתי me has been altered into אוֹתי him, in accordance with the same alteration which we are told the Sopherim made in verse 13, for though this does not alter the sense it softens it by obviating the direct reference to God. Possibly the alteration may also have included the catchword itself. The original reading may have been מַקְלִּים אוֹתִי ye have cursed me, and the Koph (D) has been changed into Cheth (D).

The catchword for the second change is קבעים which manifestly refers to Malachi III 9. The original reading here was: "with a curse ye have cursed" (מַאַרְרִים), the active participle as is evident from the parallelism:

> Ye have cursed with a curse And ye have robbed me.

As this cursing was pronounced against God which was blasphemy in the highest degree, the active was changed into the passive by the substitution of Nun (1) for Mem (2) which now makes this clause quite detached from the rest of the sentence. The anxiety to mitigate this clause is also seen from the recension which the Greek translators had before them since the Septuagint exhibits in a vision ye have seen.

 ${
m X.}$ Impious expressions towards the Almighty. — ${
m We}$ have now to adduce a few passages into which changes have been introduced by the authorised redactors of the text, but which are not expressly mentioned in the official Lists. Foremost amongst these are instances in which the original reading described blasphemy or cursing God. Such profane phrases were deemed offensive to the ears of the devote worshippers when the Scriptures were read publicly before the congregation. It was the anxiety to mitigate these harsh and impious expressions towards the Almighty which gave rise to the editorial canon in

accordance with which the Sopheric alterations were made.

2 Sam. XII 14. - "Howbeit, because by this deed thou hast given great occasion to the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme." In looking at the context it will be seen that David is charged by the Prophet with having committed the twofold crime of adultery and murder for each of which the Divine Law imposed the penalty of death (Levit. XX 10; XXIV 17). As an absolute monarch none of his subjects dared to enforce the penalty. Hence it was David himself who by his scandalous violation of God's Law preeminently blasphemed the Lord though in a secondary sense he also gave occasion for others to follow his example. Such harsh conduct towards God, however, which in ordinary cases offended the feelings of the pious, was in this particular instance more especially intolerable. The direct predicate that the Shepherd King, the sweet Singer of Israel that he had blasphemed the Lord was, therefore, mitigated by the insertion of the expression the enemies of, so that the original reading thou hast greatly blasphemed the Lord became "thou hast given great occasion to the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme". That this is an official alteration is attested by Rashi, one of the most illustrious Jewish expositors of the middle ages and the most faithful depository of the ancient traditions. He emphatically declares: "This is an alteration due to the reverence for the glory of God." The alteration is, moreover, indicated by the fact that נאץ the Piel, which occurs no fewer than thirteen times, never denotes to cause to blaspheme, but to blaspheme, to curse, to contemn; to provoke &c. and is universally rendered so even in the Authorised Version and in no single instance in the sense

CHAP. XI.

of the Hiphil. The text, therefore, as it now stands can only mean "because thou hast greatly blasphemed the enemies of the Lord" which is nonsense.

Ps. X 3. — Still more remarkable is the instance before us which exhibits the same phrase. This verse literally translated is as follows:

For the wicked boasteth of his heart's desire, And the robber blesseth blasphemeth the Lord.

It will be seen at once that the expression לבון he blesseth, is a marginal gloss on the word אול he blasphemeth, which in accordance with the principle underlying these alterations, is designed to remove the harsh and impious phrase "he blasphemeth the Lord". The text, therefore, exhibits a blending of the two recensions which obtained in two different Schools, viz. the School which had the primitive reading אול האין יהוף he blasphemeth the Lord, and the School which substituted for it הוף אול he blesseth the Lord. Some idea of the extraordinary expedients to which translators and commentators, by ignoring this fact, have resorted in order to make an intelligible sense from the text as it now stands may be gathered from the Authorised Version and the Revised Version. The Authorised Version renders the verse:

For the wicked boasteth of his heart's desire

And blesseth the covetous *whom* the Lord abhorreth

Margin Or.

And the covetous blesseth himself he abhorreth the Lord

¹ Comp. Numb. XIV 11, 23; XVI 30; Deut. XXXI 20; I Sam. II 17; Isa. I 4; V 24; LX 14; Jerem. XXIII 17; Ps. X 3, 13; LXIV 10, 18.

^{`2} In verse 13. however, of this very Psalm where the same phrase occurs, there does not seem to have been any euphemistic gloss and hence the redactors left the original reading alone. The same is the case in Isa. I, 4. Like the other editorial principles this canon for reasons which we cannot at present discuss. was not uniformly acted upon.

whilst the Revised Version translates it:

For the wicked boasteth of his heart's desire

And the covetous renounceth yea contemneth the Lord

Margin Or.

And blesseth the covetous, but revileth the Lord.

Still more objectionable and more offensive to the ear was the phrase "to curse the Lord". The official redactors of the text have, therefore, substituted in cases where it occurred, the same euphemistic expression ברך to bless, for the original reading לכל to curse, or אונדף to curse, or אונדף to blaspheme.

1 Kings XXI 10, 13. — We are told here that Jezebel suborned two worthless fellows to testify that Naboth had blasphemed both God and the king for which the Law imposed the penalty of death (Levit. XXIV 16; Deut. XIII 9, 10). But the Hebrew as it now stands, says the very reverse, inasmuch as it literally means: "Thou didst bless (בּרכֹת) God and the king". In both the Authorised Version and the Revised Version the principle which underlies this reading in the original is entirely obscured, because the verb in question is rendered blaspheme, renounce, curse &c. The verb ברך to bless, has no such antiphrastic and euphemistic sense. The assertion that because it is used as a salutation both in meeting and parting, therefore, it came to denote by a process of evolution to renounce, to blaspheme, to curse &c. is contrary to the very nature of its usage. Both in meeting and parting it expresses the kindliest sentiments, wishes for happiness and friendship and not a single instance can be adduced in which it is used even by implication to denote parting for ever in a hostile sense, much less to convey the idea of blaspheming or cursing. Such desperate

¹ Comp. 2 Kings IV 29; Prov. XXVII 14; 1 Chron. XVI 43 &c.

expedients at artificial interpretation would never have been resorted to if the canon adopted by the redactors of the text had been sufficiently attended to. Some of the best modern critics, however, now acknowledge that the original reading here was either אָבָּלְלָּאָ as the Chaldee has it or בְּלֵלְלָּאָ as it is in the Syriac and these are the two alternative readings which I have given in the notes on this passage in my edition of the text.

The sense of בוד to bless being now definitely extablished and the redactorial principle which underlies its substitution for קלל to curse, in the text having been duly set forth, it is superfluous to discuss the instances in Job in which the same Sopheric alterations have been introduced. Some of the best critics now admit that the original reading in all the four passages in question was אַרְלָּלְל, whilst others unhesitatingly exhibit it in the text. In accordance with my principle, however, not to alter the Massoretic text I have given the primitive reading in the notes with the introductory remark בייל it appears to me, I am of opinion, it ought to be, because though the reading is perfectly certain there is no MS. authority for it.

XI. The safeguarding of the Tetragrammaton and other Divine Names. — Without entering into a discussion on the pronunciation or signification of the Divine Name which is beyond the scope of this section, we have yet to call attention to the fact that the Jews from time immemorial have regarded with the utmost sacredness and reverence this incommunicable Name of the most High God, and that the awe manifested for the Tetragrammaton has played an important part in the redaction of the text. Throughout the Hebrew Bible wherever

¹ Comp Job. I 5, 11; II 5, 9.

not its own points, but those which belong to אָרֹנִי Lord, only that the Yod (י) has the simple Sheva instead of the Sheva Pathach = Chateph Pathach (יֵ) and is pronounced Adona אַרני יהוה occur together אַרני יהוה is pointed in the Massoretic text יהוה with the vowel points which belong to אַלהִים God.¹ Owing to this extreme reverence for the Ineffable Name the redactors of the text not unfrequently safeguarded it by substituting for it either אַרֹנִי Lord, which is followed throughout the Septuagint and the New Testament, or אַלהִים God.

In illustration of this fact I shall restrict myself to a few of the parallel passages which record identically the same events and about which there cannot possibly be any doubt. Both in 2 Sam. V 17—25 and 1 Chron. XIV 8—17 David's encounter with the Philistines is described. In Samuel the Tetragrammaton (יְהוֹהְיִי) is used throughout the description, whereas in Chronicles God (מֵּלְהִים) is substituted for it as will be seen from the following:

- 2 Samuel V I Chronicles XIV V 19 And David enquired of (יְדְיָה) XIV 10 And David enquired of the Lord (מֵלְהָים) God
- " 20 the Lord hath broken forth upon " II God hath broken in upon mine enemies mine enemies
- , 23 and David enquired of the , 14 and David enquired again

 Lord of God
- " 24 for then shall the Lord go out " 15 for God is gone out before before thee
- , 25 and David did so as the Lord , 16 and David did as God comcommanded him. manded him.

The same is the case in the description of the removal of the ark to the city of David of which we have also a duplicate record, one in 2 Sam. VI and one in 1 Chron. XIII as will be seen from the following:

¹ Comp. The Massorah, letter X. § 116. Vol. 1. p. 26.

2 Samuel VI

I Chronicles XIII

- VI 9 And David was afraid of (הְּהָּיָה) XIII 12 and David was afraid of the Lord (מֵאֶלהִים) God
 - " 9 the ark of the Lord " 12 the ark of God
 - " II and the ark of the Lord con, I4 and the ark of God continued tinued
- " 17 and they brought in the ark of XVI I and they brought in the ark

 the Lord of God
- , 17 and David offered before the Lord. I and they offered before

The duplicate Psalm in the Psalter itself, viz. XIV and LIII illustrates the same fact. In the former the Tetragrammaton is used, whilst in the latter the expression (אֵלהִים) God, is substituted for it as will be seen from the following comparison:

Psalm XIV

Psalm LIII

- XIV 2 The Lord (דְּהָּדְה) looked down LIII 3 God (אַלהִים) looked down from heaven
 - 4 and call not upon the Lord , 5 they call not upon God
 - ", 7 when the Lord bringeth back ", 6 when God bringeth back the captivity.

There are, however, a number of compound names in the Bible into the composition of which three out of the four letters of the Incommunicable Name have entered. Moreover, these letters which begin the names in question are actually pointed in Jeho, as the Tetragrammaton itself and hence in a pause at the reading of the first part of the name it sounded as if the reader was pronouncing the Ineffable Name. To gaurd against it an attempt was made by a certain School of redactors of the text to omit the letter He (i) so that the first part of the names in question has been altered from Jeho (ii) into Jo (ii). It was, however, only an attempt on the part of a certain School for as we shall see from the following analysis, the alterations were only partially carried out and in most cases the primitive

orthography has survived. In the examination of them I shall give these names according to the order of the Hebrew alphabet and must premise that for the purposes of this investigation no notice can be taken of the fact that two, three or more persons have often the same name in the Bible.

(ו) יהוֹאָקוֹי Jehoachaz = whom Jehovah sustains, which occurs twenty-four times, has retained the primitive orthography in twenty passages, viz. 2 Kings X 35; XIII 1, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 22, 25, 25; XIV 8, 17; XXIII 30, 31, 34; 2 Chron. XXI 17; XXV 17, 23, 25; XXXVI 1 and it is only in four places that it has been altered into

לְּאָרָהְיּ Joachaz, viz. 2 Kings XIV 1; 2 Chron. XXXIV 8; XXXVI 2, 4. With the exception of 2 Kings XIV 1 the marked distinction between the two different spellings which the Hebrew exhibits is obliterated in the Authorised Version.

(2) יְהוֹאָשׁ Jehoash = whom Jehovah bestowed, which occurs sixty-four times, has only retained the original spelling in the following seventeen passages: 2 Kings XII 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 19; XIII 10, 25; XIV 8, 9, 11, 13, 13, 15, 16, 17, whilst no fewer than forty-seven passages

שָּׁאָני Joash is exhibited in the altered orthography, viz. Judg. VI 11, 29, 30, 31; VII 14; VIII 13, 29, 32, 32; 1 Kings XXII 26; 2 Kings XI 2; XII 20, 21; XIII 1, 9, 10, 12, 13, 13, 14, 25; XIV 1, 1, 3, 17, 23, 23, 27; Hos. I 1; Amos I 1; 1 Chron. III 11; IV 22; XII 3; 2 Chron. XVIII 25; XXII 11; XXIV 1, 2, 4, 22, 24; XXV 17, 18, 21, 23, 23, 25, 25. The altered form, therefore, has prevailed in this name.

(3) יְהוֹיְבֶּר Jehozabad = whom Jehovah bestowed, which occurs thirteen times, has the primitive spelling in only four instances, viz. 2 Kings XII 22; 1 Chron. XXVI 4; 2 Chron. XVII 18; XXIV 26; whereas

יוֹבֶּרְ Jozabad the altered orthography is exhibited in the following ten passages: Ezra VIII 33; X 22, 23; Neh.

- VIII 7; XI 16; I Chron. XII 4, 20, 20; 2 Chron. XXXI 13; XXXV 9. Here again the altered spelling prevails.
- (4) יהוֹהְנָן 'Jehohanan = whom Jehovah graciously gave, which occurs thirty three times, retained the original orthography in the following nine instances: Ezra X 6, 28; Neh. VI 18; XII 13, 42; I Chron. XXVI 3; 2 Chron. XVII 15; XXIII 1; XXVIII 12; whereas the text exhibits the altered spelling

לְּחְבָּיָן Johanan in no fewer than twenty-four passages, viz. 2 Kings XXV 23; Jerem. XL 8, 13, 15, 16; XLI 11, 13, 14, 15, 16; XLII 1, 8; XLIII 2, 4, 5; Ezra VIII 12; Neh. XII 22, 23; 1 Chron. III 15, 24; V 35, 36; XII 4, 12. Here too the altered orthography prevails. In the Authorised Version the original spelling is obliterated.

(5) יהוֹיְדֶע 'Jehoiada = whom Jehovah knoweth, which occurs forty-seven times, has the primitive orthography in the following forty-two passages: 2 Sam. VIII 18; XX 23; XXIII 20, 22; 1 Kings 1, 8, 26, 32, 36, 38, 44; II 25, 29, 34, 35, 46; IV 4; 2 Kings XI 4, 9, 9, 15, 17; XII 3, 8, 10; Jerem. XXIX 26; 1 Chron. XI 22, 24; XII 27; XVIII 17; XXVII 5, 34; 2 Chron. XXII 11; XXIII 1, 8, 8, 9, 11, 14, 16, 18; XXIV 2, 3, 6, 12, 14, 14, 15, 17, 20, 22, 25, and the abbreviated form

יוֹיְדְעָ Joiada in the following five instances: Neh. III 6; XII 10, 11, 22; XIII 28.

(6) יְהוֹיְבֵין Jehoiachin = whom Jehovah hath appointed, which occurs eleven times, retains the original orthography in ten passages, viz. 2 Kings XXIV 6, 8, 12, 15; XXV 27, 27; Jerem. LII 31, 31; 2 Chron. XXXVI 8, 9; and it is in one instance where

יוֹיְכִיין Joiachin the altered spelling is exhibited, viz. Ezek. I 2. The Authorised Version confounds the different spellings also in this name.

(קים (קים *Jehoiakim* = **whom Jehovah hath set up**, which occurs forty-one times, has retained the original ortho-

graphy in no fewer than thirty-seven places, viz. 2 Kings XXIII 34, 35, 36; XXIV 1, 5, 6, 19; Jerem. I 3; XXII 18, 24; XXIV 1; XXV 1; XXVI 1, 21, 22, 23; XXVII 1, 20; XXVIII 4; XXXV 1; XXXVI 1, 9, 28, 29, 30, 32; XXXVII 1; XLV 1; XLVI 2; LII 2; Dan. I 1, 2; 1 Chron. III 15, 16; 2 Chron. XXXVI 4, 5, 8; and it is only in four passages where

ייְיָקִים Joiakim, the altered form is to be found in Neh. II 10, 10, 12, 26.

(8) יְהוֹיְרִיב 'Jehoiarib = whom Jehovah defends, which occurs seven times, the text exhibits the primitive orthography in only two instances, viz. I Chron. IX 10; XXIV 7, whilst in five passages the altered form

יוֹיְרִים Joiarib, is exhibited, viz. Ezra VIII 16; Neh. XI 5, 10; XII 6, 19.

(9) יְהוֹנְדֶב ' Jehonadab = whom Jehovah gave spontaneously, which occurs fifteen times, has the original spelling in the following eight passages: 2 Sam. XIII 5; 2 Kings X 15, 15, 23; Jerem. XXXV 8, 14, 16, 18, and in seven instances the text exhibits the altered form

יוֹנֶדְכ Jonadab, viz. 2 Sam. XIII 3, 3, 32, 35; Jerem. XXXV 6, 10, 19. This difference is obliterated in the Authorised Version.

(10) ווֹנְתָּזְיִי Jehonathan = whom Jehovah gave, which occurs one-hundred and twenty-one times, has the original spelling in no fewer than seventy-nine passages, viz. Judg. XVIII 30; 1 Sam. XIV 6, 8; XVIII 1, 1, 3, 4; XIX 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 7, 7; XX 1, 3, 4, 5, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 18, 25, 27, 28, 30, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 37, 38, 38, 39, 40, 42; XXI 1; XXIII 16, 18; XXXI 2; 2 Sam. 1, 4, 5, 12, 17, 22, 23, 25, 26; IV 4, 4; IX 1, 3, 6, 7; XV 27, 36; XVII 17, 20; XXI 7, 7, 12, 13, 14, 21; XXIII 32; Jerem. XXXVII 15, 20; XXXVIII 26; Neh. XII 18; 1 Chron. VIII 33, 34; IX 39, 40; XX 7; XXVII 25, 32; 2 Chron. XVII 8, and

in the following forty-two instances the text has it in the abbreviated form

לְּהָלְּוֹ Jonathan ו Sam. XIII 2, 3, 16, 22, 22; IV 1, 3, 4, 12, 12, 13, 13, 14, 17, 21, 27, 29, 39, 40, 41, 42, 42, 43, 43, 44, 45, 45, 49; XIX 1; 1 Kings I 42, 43; Jerem. XL 8; Ezra VIII 6; X 15; Neh. XII 11, 11, 14, 35; 1 Chron. II 32, 33; X 2; XI 34. In the Authorised Version this distinction is absolutely obliterated.

(וו) להוֹמֶךְ Jehoseph only occurs once, viz. Ps. LXXXI6, and in all the numerous passages where this name is to be found in the Bible it is

יוֹסֶף Joseph. In the Authorised Version the distinction is obliterated.

(וב) יְהוֹצְיָרְקְ 'Jehozadak = Jehovah maketh iust, which occurs thirteen times retains the original orthography in the following eight passages: Hag. I 1, 12, 14; II 2, 4; Zech. VI 11; 1 Chron. V 40, 41, whilst it has the abbreviated form

לְּצֶּרֶסְ Jozadak, in five instances, viz. Ezra III 2, 8; V 2; X 18; Neh. XII 26. The distinction is confounded in the Authorised Version.

(ו ז יְהוֹרֶם / Jehoram = whom Jehovah exalted, which occurs forty-nine times, has the original orthography in the following twenty-nine passages: I Kings XXII 51; 2 Kings I 17, 17; III 1, 6; VIII 16, 25, 29; IX 15, 17, 21, 21, 22, 23, 24; XII 19; 2 Chron. XVII 8; XXI 1, 3, 4, 5, 9, 16; XXII 1, 5, 6, 6, 7, 11, and the abbreviated form

לְּרָם Joram, in the following twenty passages: 2 Sam. VIII 10; 2 Kings VIII 16, 21, 23, 24, 25, 28, 28, 29, 29; IX 14, 14, 16, 16, 29; XI 2; 1 Chron. III 11; XXVI 25; 2 Chron. XXII 5, 7.

(14) יַהוֹשֶׁלָּם *Jehoshaphat* = **whom Jehovah judgeth** or **pleadeth for,** which occurs eighty-five times, has the original orthography in the following eighty-three passages: 2 Sam.

VIII 16; XX 24; I Kings IV 3, 17; XV 24; XXII 2, 4, 4, 5, 7, 8, 8, 10, 18, 29, 30, 32, 32, 41, 42, 46, 49, 50, 50, 51, 52; 2 Kings I 17; III 1, 7, 11, 12, 12, 14; VIII 16, 16; IX 2, 14; XII 19; Joel IV 2, 12; I Chron. III 10; XVIII 15; 2 Chron. XVII 1, 3, 5, 10, 11, 12; XVIII 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 7, 9, 17, 28, 29, 31, 31; XIX 1, 2, 4, 8; XX 1, 2, 3, 5, 15, 18, 20, 25, 27, 30, 31, 34, 35, 37; XXI 1, 2, 2, 12; XXII 9, whilst it has the abbreviated form

שַּׁטְּשִּׁי Joshaphat, in only two instances, viz. 1 Chron. XI 43; XV 24.

As far as I can trace it there are only four names which are compounded with Jeho (יהוֹ) and which have entirely retained their primitive orthography: (ו) יהוֹעָרָה Jehoadah = whom Jehovah adorns, which occurs twice, I Chron. VIII 36, 36. (2) יהועדן Jehoaddan, the feminine of the former name, which also occurs twice, once in 2 Kings XIV 2 in the Keri and once in 2 Chron. XXV 1. (3) להושבע Jehosheba = Jehovah is her oath, i. e. a worshipper of Jehovah which occurs once in 2 Kings XI 2 and its alternative form יהושבעת Jehoshabat which occurs twice in 2 Chron. XXII וו and (4) יהושע Jehoshua = Jehovah his helper, which occurs over two-hundred and fifty times. It will thus be seen that with these rare exceptions some of the Schools of textual critics have made efforts to substitute i Jo, for יהן Jeho, in every name which begins with the Tetragrammaton.

In no fewer than seven names, however, the redactors of the text have completely succeeded in obliterating the initial אָר שׁלָּה by substituting for it the simple אָר שׁלָּה (וּ) שׁלָּה Joab = Jehovah is his father, which occurs about one-hundred twenty-seven times. (2) אַר Joah = Jehovah is his brother, i. e. confederate, which occurs eleven times: 2 Kings XVIII 18, 26, 37; Isa. XXXVI 3, 11, 22; 1 Chron. VI 6; XXVI 4; 2 Chron. XXIX 12, 12; XXXIV 8.

V 17; 2 Chron. XXVI 21, 23; XXVII 1, 6, 7, 9. Of these names not a single instance remains in the present Masso-

retic text in which the original form אין Jeho, is exhibited.

The great reluctance manifested by the ancient authorities to pronounce the Tetragrammaton was also extended to Jah (יה), which is the half of the Ineffable Name, and though they found it difficult to substitute another expression for this monosyllable as in the case of Incommunicable Name they adopted safeguards against its being carelessly profaned. These means to which the Sopherim resorted account for several of the phenomena in our present Massoretic text.

In discussing the treatment which this monosyllabic Divine name has received from the redactors of the text it is necessary to separate the twenty-two instances in which in Jah, is unanimously recognised by the ancient Schools to stand for the fuller form in Jehovah, from those passages about which there is a difference of opinion in these Schools. By so doing we shall be better able to understand certain peculiarities which are visible throughout the Hebrew Scriptures both in the MSS. and in the editions.

The twenty-two passages, in which all the Schools agree that Jah (77) is the Divine Name, are as follows: Exod. XV 2; Isa. XII 2; XXVI 4; XXXVIII 11, 11; Ps. LXVIII 5, 19; LXXVII 12; LXXXIX 9; XCIV 7, 12;

CII 19; CXV 17, 18; CXVIII 5, 14, 17, 18, 19; CXXII 4; CXXX 3; CL 6. In all these cases the He (n) has Mappik, viz. n' which not only indicates its divinity, but is designed to conceal the original pronunciation of this Ineffable Name. With the solitary exception in Ps. LXVIII 5 [4] where it is Jah, the Authorised Version translates it Lord, being the same expression by which Jehovah is rendered without any remark in the margin to call attention to the fact that it is not the usual Tetragrammaton. The Revised Version which follows the Authorised Version in Ps. LXVIII 4 [5] has also Jah in Ps. LXXXIX 8 [9]. The Revisers, however, consistently remarks in the margin against every instance "Heb. Jah".

The essential difference between the ancient Schools is with regard to in Jah, in the expression in Hallelujah. To understand the controversy on this subject it is necessary to refer to some of the canons by which the Scribes had to be guided in copying the Sacred Scriptures. Wherever, the Scribe in transcribing the text, came to one of the divine names he had to pause and mentally to sanctify the sacred name. If he made a mistake in copying a divine name, writing the Lord instead of God &c. he was not allowed to erase it, but he had to enclose it in a square to show that it is cancelled. Moreover he was not allowed to divide a divine name writing one half at the end of the line, and the other half at the beginning of the next line.

As Hallelujah is a typical expression and as the controversy about it affects a whole class of words terminating with jah (ה), and moreover, as this is reflected in the MSS. and in the editions, we subjoin the discussion. In the Jerusalem Talmud it is as follows:

About Hallelujah there is a difference of opinion between Rab and Samuel, one says it should be divided into two words, the other says it

should not be divided. According to the one who says it is to be divided if jah must not be erased, whilst according to the other who says it should not be divided if jah may be erased and we do not know which is which Now from what Rab said I heard from my uncle [R. Chiga] if any one were to give me the Psalter of R. Meier I would erase all the Hallelujahs because he did not sanctify the word in writing it, wrongly regarding if jah as common, it is he [i. e. Rab] who said that Hallelu-jah is in two words. However, the opinion of the teachers is divided for R. Simon says in the name of R. Joshua b. Levi the Psalter uses ten different expressions for praise and Hallelujah is the most sublime of them all because the Divine name and praise are both combined therein (Jerusalem Megilla I, 9).1

In the Babylon Talmud, however, where the same canon about the orthography of Hallelujah is discussed we are told that it is Rab who in accordance with the Codex of his uncle R. Chiga divided it into two words, viz. $praise\ ye\ the\ Lord$, as will be seen from the following statement:

It was asked: How is Hallelujah written according to Rab? It was answered: Because Rab said I have seen the Psalter of my uncle [R. Chiga] in which Hallelu was written in one line and jah in another line [hence he divided it]. Now in this he differed from R. Joshua b. Levi, for R. Joshua b. Levi said the meaning of Hallelujah is praise ve exceedingly. In this, however, R. Joshua is inconsistent with himself because R. Joshua b. Levi had said the Psalter uses ten different expressions for praise and Hallelujah is the most sublime of them all for the Divine name and praise are combined herein (Pesachim 117a).

ו הללויה רב ושמואל חד אמר הללו יה וחורנה אמר הללויה מ"ד הללו יה נחלק ואינו נמחק מ"ד הללויה נמחק ואינו נחלק ולא ידעין מאן אמר דא ומאן אמר דא מחלק ואינו נמחק מ"ד הללויה מחק אני מן מה דאמר רב שמעית מן חביבי אם יתן לי אדם ספר תילים של ר"מ מוחק אני את כל הללויה שבו לא נתכוון לקדשו הוי דו אמר הללויה מיליהון דרבנן פליגין רא"ר סימון בשם ריב"ל בעשרה לשנות של שבח נאמר ספר תילים באישור בניצוח בניגון בשיר במזמור בהשכל ברינה בתודה בתפילה בברכה המאושר שבכולם הללויה שהשם והשבח כלולין בי.

2 איבעיא להו הללויה לרב מאי ת"ש ראמר רב חזינא תילי דבי חביבי דכתיב בהו הללו בחד ניסא ויה בחד ניסא ופלינ' דר' יהושע בן לוו דא"רי בן לוו מאי הללויה הללויה בהילולים הרבה ופלינא דידיה אדידיה דא"ר בן לוו בעשרה מאמרות של שבח נאמר ספר תהלים בניציח בנינון במשביון במזמור בשיר באשרי בתהילה בתפילה בהירא' בהללויה נדול מכולן הללויה שכולל שם ושבח בכת אחת.

We are not called upon to reconcile the apparent contradiction in the views recorded in the names of these great Talmudic luminaries. That which is of the utmost importance to us, inasmuch as it explains the variants exhibited in the Biblical MSS, and in the Massoretic editions of the text, is the fact that three distinct traditions represented by three different Schools are here set forth. According to the tradition in one School, Hallelujah consists of two separate words and the second word or the monosyllable jah is the Divine name. Hence in writing it the Scribe must treat it as such, sanctify it when copying it and in case of an error must not erase it which he is allowed to do with an ordinary mistake. In harmony with this School, therefore, הללו Hallu is the imperative plural, וה jah the Divine name is the object, and the phrase must be translated praise ve Jehovah. And there can hardly be any doubt that this exhibits the primitive reading which is uniformly followed in the Authorised Version and in the Revised Version.

According to the second School, however, Hallelujah is one inseparable word and the termination jah simply denotes power, might, i. e. powerfully, mightily, just as אַרְיִי אֵל is used to denote excellence, beauty &c. in the combination of אַרְיִי אֵל which the Authorised Version translates goodly cedars in Ps. LXXX 10 [11]. Hence in writing it the Scribe need not sanctify it and may erase it in case he wrote it by mistake. It is simply a musical interjection like the now meaningless Selah. In accordance with this view the Septuagint and the Vulgate simply transliterate it as if it were a proper name. Most unaccountably the Authorised Version only exhibits this view in the margin in eight instances, viz. Ps. CVI 1; CXI 1; CXII 1; CXIII 1; CXLVII 1; CXLVIII 1; CXLIX 1; CL 1, taking no notice whatever of this alternative view in the other sixteen

passages. The Revised Version, however, consistently exhibits the transliterated form in the margin.

Whilst according to the third School, Hallelujah though undivided still contains the sacred name and is, therefore, divine. R. Joshua who represents this School maintains, therefore, in opposition to Rab and R. Ishmael that the sacredness of the word jah is not at all affected by Hallelujah being written as one word. Hence the MSS. and the editions greatly vary in the treatment of Hallelujah. Some have it הַלְלֹנִיהְ as one word with Dagesh in the He, some have it הַלְלִנִיהְ as two words with Makkeph and Dagesh in the He and some as הַלְלִנִיהְ as one word without Dagesh in the He, thus obliterating the Divine name altogether.

The diversity in the orthography of the term Hallelu-jah, however, is not the only effect traceable to the reluctance on the part of the Sopherim to pronounce the Ineffable Name even in this abbreviated form. Having reduced it to a simple interjection its exact position in the respective Psalms became as great a matter of indifference as the musical expression *Selah*. We have seen that Hallelu-jah originally denoted *Praise ye Jehovah*. This is incontestably established by the parallelism in Ps. CXXXV 3:

Praise ye Jehovah, for Jehovah is good; Make melody unto his name, for it is pleasant.

As such the phrase was a summons by the prelector addressed to the worshipping assembly in the Temple or in the Synagogue to join in the responsive praises to the Lord just as is the case in Psalm. XXXIV 4, where the Psalmist calls upon the congregation:

O magnify Jehovah with me
And let us exalt his name together.

Hallelu-jah had, therefore, a liturgical meaning and as such it naturally stood at the beginning of the respective

Psalms which are antiphonous and in the recital of which the congregation repeated the first verse after each consecutive verse recited by the prelector. This is attested by the Septuagint which never has Hallelu-jah at the end of the Psalms, but invariably begins the Psalm with it as will be seen from the following analysis. Altogether Hallelujah occurs twenty-four times in the Massoretic text.1 Deducting the one passage where it is in the middle of the text, viz. Ps. CXXXV 3, Hallelujah only begins the Psalm in ten instances,2 whereas it now ends the Psalm no fewer than thirteen times³ and as a natural consequence it has entirely lost its primitive liturgical meaning, that is the summons to the congregation to engage in the responses. In the recension of the Hebrew text, however, from which the Septuagint was made, Hallelujah which ends the Psalms in the present Massoretic text, began the next Psalm in seven out of the thirteen instances in question,4 whilst in the remaining six instances Hallelujah was absent altogether.⁵ It is to be added that the Septuagint has in two instances Hallelujah which are not exhibited in the present Massoretic text, viz. Psalms

¹ Comp. Ps CIV 35; CV 45; CVI I, 48; CXI I; CXIII I; CXIII I, 9 CXV 18; CXVI 19; CXVII 2; CXXXV I, 3, 21; CXLVI I, 10; CXLVII I, 20; CXLVIII I, 14; CXLIX I, 9; CL I. 6.

³ Comp. Ps. CIV 35; CV 45; CVI 48; CXIII 9; CXV 18; CXVI 19; CXVII 2; CXXXV 21; CXLVI 10; CXLVII 20; CXLVIII 14; CXLIX 9; CL 6. Comp. *The Massorah*, Vol. III, p. 4.

⁴ Comp. (1) Sept. Ps. CV I = Heb. CIV 35; (2) Sept. Ps. CVII I = Heb. CVI 48; (3) Sept. Ps. CXIV I = Heb. CXIII 9; (4) Sept. Ps. CXVII I = Heb. XV 18; (5) Sept. Ps. CXVII I = Heb. CXVII 19; (6 Sept. Ps. CXVIII I = Heb. CXVII 2 and (7) Sept. Ps. CXXXVI I = Heb. CXXXV 21.

⁵ Comp Ps. CV 45; CXLVI 10; CXLVII 20; CXLVIII 14; CXLIX 9;

CXVI 10 and CXLVII 12, thus showing that in the Hebrew recension from which it was made האמנתי כי אדבר I believed, therefore, have I spoken, and שַבּחִי יִרוּשֵׁלָם אַת־יִהוָה Praise the Lord, O Jerusalem, each began a new Psalm and that these two Psalms were originally four Psalms.

The exact position of Hallelujah, however, is not simply a point of difference between the Hebrew recension from which the Septuagint was made and that exhibited in the present Massoretic text. As late as the third century of the present era the controversy still continued between the celebrated doctors of the Law. The head of one School still maintained that Hallelujah must always begin the Psalm as it is in the Septuagint, whilst the chief of another School contended as strongly that it must always end the Psalm of which, however, we have no examples in the MSS. at present known. To reconcile these two opposite traditions the head of a third School declared that he had seen a Psalter in which Hallelujah was always in the middle between two Psalms (Pesachim 117a),1 because it was difficult to decide whether it belonged to the end of the preceding Psalm or to the beginning of the following Psalm. This is exactly its position in some of the best MSS, which have no vacant space between the separate Psalms and it is this which I have endeavoured to exhibit in my edition of the text.2

As has already been remarked Hallelujah is simply a typical instance illustrating the anxiety on the part of the redactors of the text to deprive the monosyllable jah of its divine import wherever this could feasibly be done.

י אמר רב חסדא הללויה סוף פירקא רבה בר רב הונא אמר הללויה ריש פירקא אמר רב חסדא חזינא להו לתילי דבי רב חנין בר רב דכתים בהו הללויה באמצע פירקא.

² A most able article on Hallelujah by the late Professor Graetz appeared in the Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums, Vol. XXVIII. p. 193 &c., Krotoshin 1879.

Hence the ancient authorities have also discussed other groups of words which end in jah ($\neg n$), and as the different Schools of textual critics could not agree about the orthography of these expressions both the text and the Massorah exhibit variations in the writing of sundry words throughout the Hebrew Bible. Of these differences we can only adduce a few examples.

Exod. XVII 16 exhibits one of the attempts to deprive jah (יה) of its primitive sense. The Westerns or the Palestinians we are distinctly told read it מסיה as one word with He Raphe 1 and the passage is accordingly translated "for the hand is upon the precious throne" as the Chaldee has it, thus obliterating the divinity from the syllable jah. As we follow the Western School I have given this reading in the text. The Septuagint which also exhibits the reading of one word takes it as כמיה concealed from to hide, and hence renders it "for with a hidden hand will the Lord war with Amalek". The Easterns or the Babylonian School, however, divide it into two words and retain the primitive reading jah = Jehovah. Accordingly the passage is to be rendered "for the hand is upon the throne of Jehovah" which is explained to mean the sign of an oath. This reading, in accordance with the principles of the Massoretic text, I have given in the notes. The difficulty, however, in which it lands us, may be seen from the forced alternative renderings exhibited in the margins of both the Authorised Version and the Revised Version.

Now adhering to the primitive jah (יה) = Jehovah, which the Sopherim tried to obliterate, it is evident from

¹ Thus the Massorah הַ מְלְהְ מלה מל מלין ה' מלין ה' מלין הוא חד מון מלה חדא והוא חד מלין ה' מלה מלין הוא חד מון מלין הוא MS. No. 1—3 in the National Library Paris, comp. *The Massorah*, letter ', § 160, Vol. I. p. 709.

the phrase "Jehovah nissi" (נְפָי) = Jehovah is my banner, of which מכו is the usual explanation following the name, that we ought to read ב banner for ב, which occurs nowhere else in the Hebrew Bible and the passage is to be translated:

And Moses built an altar and called the name of it Jehovah is my banner for he said surely the hand is on the banner of Jehovah; the war of Jehovah against Amalek is to be from generation to generation.

And though this reading is required by the context and is now accepted by some of the best critics yet as there is no MS. authority for it, I have simply given it in the notes with the introductary remark 5"1 the reading appears to me to be &c.

Josh. XV 28 is another instance in which the obliteration of the monosyllable jah in its separate existance for Jehovah has taken place. According to the Westerns which we follow, Bizjothjah (בּזיוֹתיה) the city in the south of Judah has its meaning partly obscured by the reluctance on the part of the redactors to exhibit the Divine name in its unmistakable form in such a combination. The Eastern School of textual critics, however, manifested here also no such awe and hence preserved the orthography בּוִיוֹת־יָה Bizjothjah = the contempt of Jehovah in two words. The recension, however, from which the Septuagint was made undoubtedly exhibits the original reading ובנחיה and towns or villages thereof. This is not only confirmed by the fact that it is the formula used in this very chapter (comp. verse 45) and is generally employed in the enumeration of the districts especially in the book of Joshua,1 but from the parallel passages in Neh. XI 27, where this very verse is almost literally given and where it is as follows: ובחצר שועל ובבאר

¹ Comp. Josh. XV 47, where it occurs twice, and XVII II. where it is used four times in the same verse.

ישבע וּבְנֹחִיהָ and at Huzar-shual and at Beer-sheba and the villages thereof. And though there can hardly be any doubt that this is the correct reading as is now acknowledged by some of the best critics, I have only given it in the notes with the usual introductory phrase $rac{1}{2}$ = the proper reading is, when it is supported by the ancient Versions.

Jerem. II 31 strikingly illustrates the reluctance on the part of one School of redactors to exhibit the name Jehovah when it could possibly be obviated. According to the Eastern School the passage before us is to be translated as follows:

> O generation, see ye the word of Jehovah, Have I been a wilderness unto Israel? Is the land the darkness of Jehovah?

The Lord expostulates here with his backsliding people by emphatically declaring that whilst they submitted to his guidance the land never failed to yield its rich harvests. The interrogative form as is often the case is used for an emphatic negative, figuratively asserting the very reverse, viz. "I have been a paradise to Israel, the land was brightened by the light of Jehovah." To predicate, however, darkness of Jehovah was regarded by the Eastern School of redactors as unseemely. Hence they closely combined jah (יה) with מאפל darkness and by this means deprived it of its divinity. It is due to this fact that some interpreters take it simply to be the feminine form of מאפל, i. e. מאפלה darkness, which is manifestly the view exhibited in the Authorised Version, whilst others assign to jah (יה) the meaning of intensity as is done in the text of the Revised Version. The common rendering which as usual

It is hardly necessary to remark in justification of our rendering that $\Box \aleph = \overline{\eta}$ are not unfrequently used together in two consecutive clauses in continuation of the interrogative without being a disjunctive for $\overline{\eta} = \overline{\eta}$. Comp. Gen. XXXVII 8.

is based upon the Western recension, mars the rhythm and is against the parallelism of the passage.

Ps. CXVIII 5. — According to the canon laid down by the Sopherim and the Massorah במרחביה is one word and is simply another form of במרחב (Hos. IV 16; Ps. XXXI 9), denoting literally in a large place, with room, and then figuratively with freedom, with deliverance, just as which means strait, is used tropically for distress, affliction in the first clause of this very verse and in Ps. IV 2; XLIV 6 &c. This is the reading of the textus receptus which follows the Western recension. The verse accordingly is to be translated:

Out of my straits I called on Jehovah He answered me with deliverance.

This reading is also exhibited in the recension of the text from which the Septuagint was made. According to the Easterns or Babylonians, however, the reading is two words and hence the verse in question ought to be rendered:

Out of my straits I called on Jehovah

He answered me with the deliverance of Jehovah.

That is with a freedom or deliverance which Jehovah only can vouchsafe. It is, therefore, evident that we have here another instance where the Western School of textual critics have tried to safeguard the shorter form of the Ineffable Name by fusing it with the preceding word since the phrase מרחב־יה the wideness of Jehovah, in its literal form appeared to them too bold a metaphor. It is remarkable that the Authorised Version and the Revised Version, as well as many modern expositors depart here from the received Massoretic text without even giving the alternative

י For similar duplicate forms comp. עלילָה work Ps. XIV I &c. and עלילָה work Jerem. XXXII וואָרָה judging Job XXXI אול איל שליליה judging Isa. XXVII 7.

reading in the margin. By detaching, moreover, הי from and by needlessly transferring it from the end to the beginning of the line they are obliged to assume that we have here a constructio praegnans and to supply the words "and set me" which mar the parallelism.

Song of Songs VIII 6. — Owing to the same reluctance to exhibit the shorter name of Jehovah, the Western School of textual critics whom we follow in the textus receptus read ישלְהֶבְּהְיָה in one word which is explained to mean intense flame or as the Authorised Version renders it "which hath a most vehement flame". In the recension from which the Septuagint was made these consonants were also read as one word and they were pronounced שֵׁלְהָבֹתִיהְ שֵּׁלְהָבֹתִיהְ the flames thereof. According to the Eastern recension, however, which is also the reading of Ben-Naphtali and several early editions it is שֵׁלְהֶבֶּתִּרִיהְ the flame of Jehovah, and the whole verse is to be rendered:

For love is strong as death
Affection as inexorable as Hades
Its flames are flames of fire
The flames of Jehovah.

That is loving flames kindled in the human heart emanate from Jehovah. The anxiety, however, on the part of the Sopherim not to describe Jehovah as the source of human love, and especially not to exhibit him in parallelism with Hades has caused the Western redactors of the text to obliterate the name of God in the only place where the Divine name occurs in this book. The Revised Version, though contrary to the *textus receptus*, exhibits the true reading in the text and gives the alternative translation in the margin.

We have seen that in the case of proper names which are compounded with the Tetragrammaton and where it begins the name, the He ($\overline{\ }$) has been elided to preclude the pronunciation of the Divine name. For the same reason

Jah (त) the shorter form of Jehovah has been safeguarded in those proper names into which it has entered into composition and where it constitutes the end of the proper name. To effect this, the redactors of the text have adopted the reverse process. Instead of eliding a letter they have added one and converted the monosyllabic Divine name into a bisyllabic word.

The one hundred and forty-one proper names in the Hebrew Bible which according to the Massoretic text end with Jah = Jehovah are divisible into three classes: (1) The first consists of fifty-nine names, which have in many instances the Vav appended to them so that they respectively occur in duplicate form sometimes terminating in Jah and sometimes in Jahu. They are as follows:

```
אָבּיְהָּה whose father is Jehovah: I Sam. VIII 2; I Kings XIV I;

Neb. X 8; XII 4, 17; I Chron. II 24; III 10; VI 13; VII 8;

XXIV 10; 2 Chron. XI 20, 22; XII 16; XIII 1, 2, 3, 4, 15, 17,
19, 22, 23; XXIX I.
```

אבירה Abijahu: 2 Chron. XIII 20, 21.

אַרְיָהְ Adonijah = my Lord is Jehovah: 2 Sam. III 4; 1 Kings I 5, 17, 18; II 28; Neh. X 17; 1 Chron. III 2.

ארֹנְיְהוּ Adonijahū: I Kings I 8, 9, 11, 13, 24, 25, 41, 42, 43, 49, 50, 51; II 13, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24; 2 Chron. XVII 8.

אורייָה Urijah = my light is Jehovah: 2 Sam. XI 3, 6, 6, 7, 8, 8, 9, 10, 10, 11, 12, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 21, 24, 26, 26; XII 9, 10, 15; XXIII 39; 1 Kings XV 5; 2 Kings XVI 10, 11, 11, 15, 16; Isa, VIII 2; Ezra VIII 33; Neh. III 4, 21; VIII 4; 1 Chron. XI 41.

אוריהוד Urijahu: Jerem. XXVI 20, 21, 23.

אַרְּחָיְהְ Ahazjah = upheld of Jehovah: 2 Kings I 2; IX 16, 23, 27, 29; XI 2; 2 Chron. XX 35.

אַרוּוְיְרוּ Ahazjahū: 1 Kings XXII 40, 50, 52; 2 Kings I 18; VIII 24, 25, 26, 29; IX 21, 23; X 13, 13; XI 1, 2; XII 19; XIII 1; XIV 13; 1 Chron. III 11; 2 Chron. XX 37; XXII 1, 1, 2, 7, 8, 8, 9, 9, 10, 11, 11.

אָרְיָה Ahijah = brother of Jehovah: I Sam. XIV 3, 18; I Kings IV 3; XI 29, 30; XII 15; XIV 2, 4; XV 27, 29, 33; XXI 22; 2 Kings IX 9; Neh. X 27; I Chron. II 25; VIII 7; XI 36; XXVI 20; 2 Chron. IX 29.

אָחיָהוּ Ahijahū: 1 Kings XIV 4, 5, 6, 18; 2 Chron. X 15.

```
אֵלְיָהְ Elijah = my God is Jehovah: 2 Kings I 3, 4, 8, 12; Ezek. X 21, 26; Mal. III 23; I Chron. VIII 27.
```

אַלְיְהֵוּ I Kings XVII I, 13, 15, 16, 18, 22, 23, 23, 24; XVIII I, 2, 7, 7, 8, 11, 14, 15, 16, 17, 21, 22, 25, 27, 30, 31, 36, 40, 40, 41, 42, 46; XIX I, 2, 9, 13, 13, 19, 20, 21; XXI 17, 20, 28; 2 Kings I 10, 13, 15, 17; II I, I, 2, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 14, 14, 15; III II; IX 36; X 10, 17; 2 Chron. XXI 12.

אָמַצְיָה Amazjah = whom Jehovah strengthens: 2 Kings XII 22; XIII 12; XIV 8; XV 1; Amos VII 10, 12, 14; 1 Chron. IV 34; VI 30.

אמציהון: 2 Kings XIV 1, 9, 11, 11, 13, 15, 17, 18, 21, 23; XV 3; 1 Chron. III 12; 2 Chron. XXIV 27; XXV 1, 5, 9, 10; 11, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 25, 26, 27; XXVI 1, 4.

אָמֵרְיָה Amarjah = whom Jehovah said, i. e. promised q. d. Theophrastus: Zeph. I I; Ezra VII 3; X 42; Neh. X 4; XII 4; XII 2, 13;

I Chron. V 33, 33, 37, 37; VI 37; XXIII 19.

Amarjahū: I Chron. XXIV 23; 2 Chron. XIX 11; XXXI 15.

Benajah = Built up of Jehovah: 2 Sam. XX23; Ezek. XI 13; Ezra X 25,

30, 35, 43; 1 Chron. IV 36; XI 22, 31; XXVII 14; 2 Chron. XX 14.

Benajahū: 2 Sam. VIII 18; XXIII 20, 22. 30; 1 Kings I 8, 10, 26, 32, 36, 38, 44; II 25, 29, 30, 30, 34. 35, 46; IV 4; Ezek XI 1; 1 Chron. XI 24; XV 18, 20, 24; XVI 5, 6; XVIII 17; XXVII 5, 6, 34; 2 Chron. XXXI 13.

I 1; Ezra X 18.

Gedaljahū: 2 Kings XXV 22, 23, 23, 24, 25; Jerem XXXVIII 1;

XXXIX 14; XL 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16; XLI 1, 2, 3,

נְּמַרְיָה Gemarjah = Perfected of Jehovah: Jerem. XXIX 3.

4, 6, 9, 10, 18; XLIII 6; 1 Chron. XXV 3, 9.

נְמַרְיָהוּ Gemarjahū: Jerem. XXXVI 10, 11, 12, 25.

וְּלְיָה Delajah = Freed of Jehovah: Ezra II 60; Neh. VI 10; VII 62;
I Chron. III 24.

וְּלְיְהוּ Delajahu: Jerem. XXXVI 12, 25; I Chron. XXIV 18.

הוריה Hodavjah = Praise of Jehovah: Ezra II 40; I Chron. V 24; IX 7. הוריה Hodavjahū: I Chron. III 24.

וֹבּרְיָה Zebadjak = Jehovah gave: Ezra VIII 8; X 20; 1 Chron. VIII 15, 17; XII 7; XXVII 7.

וְבְּרָהְּ Zebadjahū: 1 Chron. XXVI 2; 2 Chron. XVII 8; XIX 11.

```
CHAP. XI.
```

וֹכֵריַה Zecharjah = whom Jehovah remembers: 2 Kings XIV 29: XV 11: XVIII 2; Zech. I 1, 7; VII 1, 8; Ezra V 1; VI 14; VIII 3, 11, 16; X 26; Neh. VIII 4; XI 4, 5, 12; XII 16, 35, 41; I Chron. IX 21, 37; XV 20; XVI 5; 2 Chron. XVII 7; XXIV 20; XXXIV 12.

יבריהו Zecharjahu: 2 Kings XV 8; Isa. VIII 2; 1 Chron. V 7; XV 18, 24; XXIV 25; XXVI 2, 11, 14; XXVII 21; 2 Chron. XX 14; XXI 2; XXVI 5; XXIX 1, 13; XXXV 8.

חוקיה Hezekijah = my strength is Jehovah: 2 Kings XVIII 1, 10, 14, 14, 15, 16, 16; Zeph. I I; Prov. XXV I; Neh. VII 21; X 18;

I Chron. III 23. הוקיהו Hezekijahū: 2 Kings XVI 20; XVIII 9, 13, 17, 19, 22, 29, 30, 31, 32, 37; XIX I, 3, 5, 9, 10, 14, 14, 15, 20; XX I, 3, 5, 8, 12, 12, 13, 13, 14, 14, 15, 16, 19, 20, 21; XXI 3; Isa. XXXVI I, 2, 4, 7, 14, 15, 16, 18, 22; XXXVII 1, 3, 5, 9, 10, 14, 14, 15, 21; XXXVIII 1, 2, 3, 5, 9, 22; XXXIX 1, 2, 2, 3, 3, 4, 5, 8; Jerem. XXVI 18, 19; I Chron. III 13; 2 Chron. XXIX 18, 27; XXX 24; XXXII 15.

קלְקיה Hilkijah = my portion is Jehovah: 2 Kings XVIII 37; XXII 8, 10, 12; Jerem. XXIX 3; Ezra VII 1; Neh. VIII 4; XI 11; XII 7, 21; I Chron. V 39, 39; VI 30; IX 11; 2 Chron XXXV 8.

הַלְּקְיָהוּ Hilkijahū: 2 Kings XVIII 18, 26; XXII 4, 8, 14; XXIII 4, 24; Isa, XXII 20; XXXVI 3, 22; Terem, I I; I Chron, XXVI II; 2 Chron. XXXIV 9, 14, 15, 15, 18, 20, 22

הנניה Hananjah = whom Jehovah has graciously given: Jerem. XXVIII 1, 5, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 15, 17; XXXVII 13; Dan. I 6, 7, 11, 19; II 17; Ezra X 28; Neh. III 8, 30; VII 2; X 24; XII 12, 41; I Chron. III 19, 21; VIII 24; XXV 4.

הנניהו Hananjahū: Jerem. XXXVI 12; 1 Chron. XXV 23; 2 Chron. XXVI II.

קשבוה Hashabjah = whom Jehovah regards: Ezra VIII 19, 24; Neh. III 17; X 12; XI 15, 22; XII 21, 24; 1 Chron. VI 30; IX 14; XXV 19; XXVII 17. השביהו Hashabjahū: 1 Chron. XXV 3; XXVI 30; 2 Chron. XXXV 9.

מוֹבוּה Tobijah = my good is Jehovah: Zech. VI 10, 14; Ezra II 60; Neh. II 10, 19; III 35; IV 1; VI 1, 12, 14, 17, 17, 19; VII 62;

XIII 4, 7, 8. מוֹבְיָהוֹ Tobijahū: 2 Chron. XVII 8.

אוניה Jaazanjah = whom Jehovah hears: Jerem, XXXV 3; Ezek, XI 1. יאוניהו Jaazanjahū: 2 Kings XXV 23; Ezek, VIII 11.

```
אשׁיָה Joshijah = whom Jehovah heals: Zech. VI 10.
```

אַטִּירְהּ 'Joshijahū: I Kings XIII 2; 2 Kings XXI 24, 26; XXII 1, 3; XXIII 16, 19, 23, 24, 28, 29, 30, 34, 34; Jerem. I 2, 3, 3; III 6; XXII 11, 11, 18; XXV 1, 3; XXVI 1; XXXV 1; XXXVI 1, 2, 9; XXXVII 1; XLV 1; XLVI 2; Zeph. I 1; I Chron. III 14, 15; 2 Chron. XXXIII 25; XXXIV 1, 33; XXXV 1, 7, 16, 18, 19, 20, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 25; 26; XXXVI 1.

יוניה Jezanjah = whom Jehovah hears: Jerem. XLII 1. יוניה Jezanjahū: Jerem. XL 8.

יְחַוְקְיָה Jehizkijah (Hezekiah) = Jehovah strengthens: Hos I 1; Micah I 1; Ezra II 16.

יְהְוֹקְיְהְוּ Jehizkijahū: 2 Kings XX 10; Isa. I 1; Jerem. XV 4; 1 Chron. IV 41; 2 Chron. XXVIII 12, 27; XXIX 1, 20, 30, 31, 36; XXX 1, 18, 20, 22; XXXI 2, 8, 9, 11, 13, 20; XXXII 2, 8, 9, 11, 12, 16, 17, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 26, 27, 30, 30, 32, 33; XXXIII 3.

יבֶּלְיָה Jecholjah = able through Jehovah: 2 Chron. XXVI 3.

יכליהוי Jecholjahu: 2 Kings XV 2.

יְבְּיֵהְ Jechonjah = whom Jehovah has appointed: Jerem. XXVII 20; XXVIII 4; XXIX 2; Esther II 6; 1 Chron. III 16, 17.

יְבְנְיְהוּ Jechonjahū: Jerem. XXIV 1.

יְרִיהְ Jerijah = founded of Jehovah: 1 Chron, XXVI 31. ארייהו Jerijahū: 1 Chron, XXIII 19; XXIV 23.

יְרְמְיָה Jeremjah = whom Jehovah setteth up: Jerem. XXVII 1; XXVIII 5, 6, 10, 11, 12, 15; XXIX 1; Dan. IX 2; Ezra I 1; Neh. X 3; XII 1, 12, 34; 1 Chron. V 24; XII 4, 10.

יַרְמְּיְהוּ ' Jeremjahū: 2 Kings XXIII 31; XXIV 18; Jerem. I 1, 11; VII 1; XI 1; XIV 1; XVIII 1, 18; XIX 14; XX 1, 2, 3, 3; XXI 1. 3; XXIV 3; XXV 1, 2, 13; XXVI 7, 8, 9, 12, 20, 24; XXVIII 12; XXIX 27, 29, 30; XXX 1; XXXII 1, 2, 6, 26; XXXIII 1, 19, 23; XXXIV 1, 6, 8, 12; XXXV 1, 3, 12, 18; XXXVI 1, 4, 4, 5, 8, 10, 19, 26, 27, 27, 32, 32; XXXVII 2, 3, 4, 6, 12, 13, 14, 14, 15, 16, 16, 17, 18, 21, 21; XXXVIII 1, 6, 6, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 12, 13, 13, 14, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 24, 27, 28; XXXIX 11, 14, 15; XL 1, 2, 6; XLII 2, 4, 5, 7; XLIII 1, 2, 6, 8; XLIV 1, 15, 20, 24; XLV 1, 1; XLVI 1, 13; XLVII 1; XLIX 34; L 1; LI 59, 60, 61, 64; LII 1; 1 Chron. XII 13; 2 Chron. XXXV 25; XXXVI 12, 21, 22.

```
א בייה Ishijah = whom Jehovah lended: Ezra X 31; I Chron. VII 3;
XXIII 20; XXIV 21, 25, 25.
א יייי Ishijahū: I Chron. XII 6.
```

[יְשְׁמֵעְיָה Ishmajah = whom Jehovah heareth: 1 Chron. XII 4. יְשְׁמֵעְיָה Ishmajahū: 1 Chron. XXVII 19.

ישֵׁשְיֶה Jeshajah = help of Jehovah: Ezra VIII 7, 19; Neh. XI 7: 1 Chron.
III 21.

ישטיהו *Jeshajahū* (Isaiah): 2 Kings XIX 2, 5, 6, 20; XX 1, 4, 7, 8, 9, 11, 14, 16, 19; Isa. I 1; II 1; VII 3; XIII 1; XX 2, 3; XXXVII 2, 5, 6, 21; XXXVIII 1, 4, 21; XXXIX 3, 5, 8; I Chron. XXV 3, 15; XXVI 25; 2 Chron. XXVI 22; XXXII 20, 32.

קנוְיְהְ Chenanjah = whom Jehovah placed: ו Chron. XV 27. קנוְיְהוּ Chenanjahu: ו Chron. XV 22; XXVI 29.

מְיבֵיה Michajah = who is like Jehovah: 2 Kings XXII 12; Jerem. XXVI 18; Neh. XII 35, 41.

מיכיהו Michajahū: 2 Chron. XIII 2; XVII 7.

מִיכְיְרְהּוּ Michajhū: Judg. XVII 1, 4; I Kings XXII 8, 9, 13, 14, 15, 24, 25, 26, 28; Jerem. XXXVI 11, 13; 2 Chron. XVIII 7, 8, 12, 13, 23, 24, 25, 27.

מֵלְכָּיְה Malchijah = my king is Jehovah: Jerem. XXI I: XXXVIII I; Ezra X 25, 25, 31; Neh. III II, 14, 31; VIII 4; X 4; XI 12; XII 42; I Chron. VI 25, IX 12; XXIV 9.

מַלְבִּיְהוּ Malchijahū: Jerem. XXXVIII 6.

מַעוּיָה Maazjah = consolation of Jehovah: Neh. X 9.

מעויהו Maazjahu: 1 Chron. XXIV 18.

מעשיה Maasejah = work of Jehovah: Jerem. XXI 1; XXIX 21, 25; XXXVII 3; Ezra X 18, 21, 22, 30; Neh. III 23; VIII 4, 7; X 26; XI 5, 7; XII 41, 42.

מְשֵשְּׁהְנּ Maasejahū: Jerem. XXXV 4; I Chron. XV 18, 20; 2 Chron. XXIII 1; XXVI 11; XXVIII 7; XXXIV 8.

אָשֶׁלְמִיְהֹ Meshelemjah = whom Jehovah repays: 1 Chron. IX 21. מְשֶׁלְמִיְהוּ Meshelemjahū: 1 Chron. XXVI 1, 2, 9.

מְּחֵיהָה Mattanjah = gift of Jehovah: 2 Kings XXIV 17; Ezra X 26, 27, 30, 37; Neh. XI 17, 22; XII 8, 25, 35; XIII 13; 1 Chron. IX 15; 2 Chron. XX 14.

מתניהו Mattanjahü: 1 Chron. XXV 4, 16; 2 Chron. XXIX 13.

```
מְחְחָהָ Mattithjah = gift of Jehovah: Ezra X 43; Neh. VIII 4; I Chron. IX 31; XVI 5.
```

- מחתיהו Mattithjahu: 1 Chron. XV 18, 21; XXV 3, 21.
 - נריָה Nerijah = my lamp is Jehovah: Jerem. XXXII 12, 16; XXXVI 4, 8; XLIII 3; XLV 1; LI 59.
 - נריהו Nerijahu: Jerem. XXXVI 14, 32; XLIII 6.
- מְתְּנֶּיְתְּ Nethanjah = given of Jehovah: 2 Kings XXV 23 25; Jerem. XL
- 14, 15; XLI 1, 2, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 18; 1 Chron. XXV 2. אויר און אויין אויי
- עֹבֵּדְיָה Obadjah = servant of Jehovah: Obad. 1; Ezra VIII 9; Neh. X 6; XII 25; 1 Chron. III 21; VII 3; VIII 38; IX 16, 44; XII 9; 2 Chron. XVII 7.
- עבריה Obadjahu: I Kings XVIII 3, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 16; I Chron. XXVII 19; 2 Chron. XXXIV 12.
- עָרְיָהְ Adajah = ornament of Jehovah: 2 Kings XXII 1; Ezra X 29, 39; Neh. XI 5, 12; 1 Chron. VI 26; VIII 21; IX 12.
 - עריהו Adajahu: 2 Chron. XXIII I.
 - עניין Uzzijah = my strength is Jehovah: 2 Kings XV 13, 30; Hos. I 1; Amos I 1; Zech. XIV 5; Ezra X 21; Neh. XI 4; I Chron. VI 9.

 עניין Uzzijahu: 2 Kings XV 32, 34; Isa I 1; VI 1; VII 1; I Chron. XXVII 25; 2 Chron. XXVI 1, 3, 8, 9, 11, 14, 18, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23; XXVII 2.
- Azarjah = helped of Jehorah: 2 Kings XIV 21; XV 1, 7, 17, 23, 27; Jerem. XLIII 2; Dan. I 6, 7, 11, 19; II 17; Ezra VII 1, 3; Neh. III 23, 24; VII 7; VIII 7; X 3; XII 33; I Chron. II 8, 38, 39; III 12; V 35, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40; VI 21; IX 11; 2 Chron XXI 2; XXIII 1.
- אַרְדְּהּוּ Azarjahu: 1 Kings IV 2, 5; 2 Kings XV 6, 8; 2 Chron XV 1; XXI 2; XXII 6; XXIII 1; XXVI 17, 20; XXVIII 12; XXIX 12, 12; XXXI 10, 13
- עְחַלְיָה Athaljah = afflicted of Jehovah: 2 Kings XI 1, 3, 13, 14; Ezra VIII 7; 1 Chron. VIII 26; 2 Chron XXII 12.
- עְחַלְּיָהוּ Athaljahu: 2 Kings VIII 26; XI 2, 20; 2 Chron. XXII 2, 10, 11; XXIII 12, 13, 21; XXIV 7.
 - פְּרֵיה Pedajah = redemption of Jehovah: 2 Kings XXIII 36; Neh. III 25; VIII 4; XI 7; XIII 13; 1 Chron. III 18, 19.
 - Pedajahu: ו Chron. XXVII 20.
- אַלְטְיִה Pelatjah = deliverance of Jehovah: Neh. X 23; ו Chron III 21; IV 42. אַלְטִיהוּ Pelatjahu: Ezek, XI ו, ו 3

```
צְּרְקִיה Zidkijah (Zedekiah) = my justice is Jehovah: I Kings XXII II; Jerem.
         XXVII 12; XXVIII 1; XXIX 3; Neh. X 2; I Chron. III 16.
ערקידו Zidkijahū: 1 Kings XXII 24; 2 Kings XXIV 17, 18, 20; XXV 2
         7, 7; Jerem. I 3; XXI I, 3, 7; XXIV 8; XXVII 3; XXIX 21,
         22; XXXII I, 3, 4, 5; XXXIV 2, 4, 6, 8, 21; XXXVI 12;
         XXXVII 1, 3, 17, 18, 21; XXXVIII 5, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 24;
         XXXIX 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7; XLIV 30; XLIX 34; LI 59; LII 1, 3, 5, 8,
         10, 11; 1 Chron. III 15; 2 Chron. XVIII 10, 23; XXXVI 10, 11.
 צפניה Zephanjah = Hid or protected of Jehovah: Jerem, XXI 1; XXIX
         25 29; LII 24; Zeph. I 1; Zech. VI 10, 14; 1 Chron. VI 21.
 צפניהו Zephanjahu: 2 Kings XXV 18; Jerem. XXXVII 3.
 תחביה Rehabjah = whom Jehovah enlarges: 1 Chron. XXIII 17, 17.
רְחַבְּיָהוּ Rehabjahu: 1 Chron. XXIV 21, 21; XXVI 25.
  שרוה Serajah = warrior of Jehovah: 2 Sam. VIII 17; 2 Kings XXV 18,
         23; Jerem. XL 8; LI 59, 59, 61; LII 24; Ezra II 2; VII 1;
         Neh. X 3; XI 11; XII 1, 12; 1 Chron. IV 13, 14, 35; V 40, 40.
  שריהו Serajahū: Jerem. XXXVI 26.
 שׁבְנֵיה Shebanjah = caused to grow up of Jehovah: Neh. IX 4, 5; X 5,
          11, 13; XII 14.
 שבניהו Shebanjahu: 1 Chron. XV 24.
 שכניה Shechanjah = habitation of Jehovah: Ezra VIII 3, 5; X 2; Neh.
          III 29; VI 18; XII 3; I Chron. III 21, 22.
 שכניהוי Shechanjahu: I Chron. XXIV 11; 2 Chron. XXXI 15.
 שלמה Shelemjah = recompensed of Jehovah: Jerem. XXXVII 3, 13; Ezra
          X 39; Neh. III 30; XIII 13.
שׁלְמִיהוּ Shelemjahū: Jerem. XXXVI 14, 26; XXXVIII 1; Ezra X 41;
          I Chron, XXVI 14.
 שמעיה Shemajah = Heard of Jehovah: I Kings XII 22; Jerem. XXIX 31,
          31, 32; Ezra VIII 13, 16; X 21, 31; Neh. III 29; VI 10; X 9;
          XI 15; XII 6, 18, 34, 35, 36, 42; 1 Chron. III 22, 22; IV 37;
          V 4; IX 14, 16; XV 8, 11; XXIV 6; XXVI 4, 6, 7; 2 Chron.
          XII 5, 7, 15; XXIX 14.
 שמעיהוּ Shemajahu: Jerem. XXVI 20; XXIX 24; XXXVI 12; 2 Chron.
          XI 2; XVII 8; XXXI 15; XXXV 9.
שמריה Shemarjah = Guarded of Jehovah: Ezra X 32, 41; 2 Chron. XI 19.
שׁמֵרְיַהוּ Shemarjahü: I Chron. XII 5.
 שׁבְּטִיה Shephatjah = judge of Jehovah: 2 Sam. III 4; Jerem. XXXVIII 1;
```

Ezra II 4, 57; VIII 8; Neb. VII 9, 59; XI 4; 1 Chron. III 3;

אַפְּטִידּה Shephatjahu: 1 Chron, XII 5; XXVII 16; 2 Chron XXI 2.

IX 8.

Both in the Authorised Version and in the Revised Version the distinction between these two forms of the same name is entirely obliterated. By ignoring the last syllable and by transliterating both forms alike, the translators have deprived the student of the means to ascertain how far the process of safeguarding the name Jehovah or Jah has been carried out in the different books.

(2) The second class consists of proper names compounded with Jah (יָר) which have uniformly been lengthened into jahu (יָרוּ). Of these we have the following eleven examples:

אַצְלְיְהוּ Azaljahū = reserved of Jehovah: 2 Kings XXII 3; 2 Chron. XXXIV 8.

אַקּיָדה Bukkijahū = emptying of Jehovah: 1 Chron. XXV 4, 13.

יברכיהוּ Jeberechjahu = he will be blessed of Jehovah: Isa. VIII 2.

יְנְדֵּלְיְהוּ Igdaljahū = Jehovah will make him great: Jerem. XXXV 4.

יְחְדְּיְהוּ Jehdejahū = Jehovah will make him joyful: I Chron. XXIV 20; XXVII 30.

בּנְיְדְהָּ Conjahu = established of Jehovah: Jerem. XXII 24, 28; XXXVII 1.

קבוניהוף Conanjahu (the Keri), 2 Chron. XXXI 12, 13; XXXV 9.

מְקְנֵיְהוּ Miknejahū = possession of Jehovah: 1 Chron. XV 18, 21.

ממכיהו Semachjahu = sustained of Jehovah: 1 Chron. XXVI 7.

אַנווְדְהּ Azazjahū = strengthened of Jehovah: I Chron. XV 21; XXVII 20; 2 Chron. XXXI 13.

רְמַלְיְהוּ Remaljahu = Adorned of Jehovah: 2 Kings XV 25, 27, 30, 32, 37; XVI I, 5; Isa. VII I, 4, 5, 9; VIII 6; 2 Chron. XXVIII 6.

It will be seen that with the exception of the last name all the others are of infrequent occurrence. It is probably due to this fact that the process of uniformity has been successfully carried out by the redactors of the text. Here again both the Authorised Version and the Revised Version have taken no notice whatever that these names end in $jah\bar{u}$ (17) and have transliterated them as if they terminated in jah (17).

(3) The third class consists of the names compounded with the Divine name jah (\overrightarrow{a}) which the redactors of the text have not attempted to safeguard by converting the ending into $jah\overline{u}$ (\overrightarrow{a}). There are no fewer than seventy-one such proper names which have retained their primitive orthography and as they have not undergone any change I need not enumerate them.

This, however, is not the only way in which the redactors of the text guarded against the pronunciation of the abbreviated form of the Tetragrammaton. Instead of adding a syllable they often elided the He (17) altogether or substituted another letter for it. Thus

אָביָה Abijah, which is sometimes lengthened into אָביָה Abijahū has the letter He (ה) dropped altogether and is abbreviated into אָבי Abi. This is evident from a comparison of I Chron. XXIX I with 2 Kings XVIII 2 where the mother of Hezekiah is called by two apparently contradictory names in these two passages.

יִשְׁמֵרִי *Ishmerai* in ז Chron. VIII ז is now acknowledged to stand for יִשְׁמֵרִי = kept by Jehovah. Not only has the He (ה) here been elided which deprives the last syllable of the divine name Jah (הָּה), but the vowel-points have been adapted to this altered form.

Exactly the same process has been adopted in Ezra X 34 where מַעַּדִי Maadai simply exhibits an altered form of מַעַּדִי Maadjah = ornament of Jehovah, which occurs in Neh. XII 5, and in the name מַּתְּנִי Mattenai. This name which occurs three times (Ezra X 33, 37; Neh. XII 19) is simply an abbreviated form of מַתְּנִיה Mattanjah = gift of Jehovah, with the divine name Jah obliterated.

עבריָה Obadjah = worshipper of Jehovah, which has in several places been altered into עבריָה Obadjah \bar{u} , and which occurs in its original orthography in I Chron. IX 16 as the

descendant of the Levites, is spelled עַבְּדָא Abda = servant in Neh. XI וון though it describes the identical person.

The same is the case with שַׁמֵּשְיָה Shemajah = heard of Jehovah, a son of Galal who is mentioned in the lists of the Levites in I Chron. IX 16, whilst in the list in Neh. XI 17 the name of this son of Galal is spelled שַׁמַשׁיַּ Shammua = heard, with the monosyllable Jah = Jehovah entirely gone. Such was the anxiety to safeguard the Tetragrammaton.

The extent to which this process of undeifying jah (n') has been carried, and the effect it had upon the redaction of the Hebrew text may be judged from the fact that the ancient authorities went so far as to take it in the sense of the Greek interjection lú, lov and regarded it as an exclamation of sorrow and pain. Thus the Midrash Rabba on Gen. XLIII 14 remarks as follows:

R. Phineas said in the name of R. Hosejah: It is not said here "blessed is the man whom thou chastenest, O Jehovah" [Ps. XCIV 12], but "blessed is the man whom thou chastenest O Jah". That is just as one who is sentenced by the judge cries out in his pain and says $\lambda \omega$ to \tilde{v} enough, enough! so Jacob said He who will say of the sufferings it is enough will also say of my sufferings it is enough! Because it is said God Almighty give you mercy before the man &c.1

The ancient redactors of the text have also tried to safeguard the other Divine names, notably Elohim (אֵלוֹהִים) and El (אֵלוֹהִים) God, though not to the same extent as they have protected the Tetragrammaton. Without entering minutely into all the results arising from the protection of these names I shall only advert to some of the phenomena in the Hebrew text due to this cause.

רבי פנחם בשם רבי הושעיא אמר אשרי הגבר אשר תיסרנו ה' אין כתיכ כאן אלא אשר תיסרנו יה כזה שהוא נדון לפני הדיין צועק ומצטער ואומר יה די די, כך אלא אשר תיסרנו יה כזה שהוא נדון לפני הוא אמר ליסורי די, שנאמר ואל שדי יתן לכם אמר יעקב מי שעתיד ליסורים די הוא יאמר ליסורי די, שנאמר ואל שדי יתן לכם אמר יעקב מי שעתיד ליסורים די הוא יאמר לפני האיש ונו' מדרש רבה מקץ פרשה צב:

The proper name Daniel occurs eighty-one times in the Bible, thirty times in the Hebrew text and fifty-one times in the Chaldee portion of the book of this celebrated prophet of the Babylonish captivity. Both in the Authorised Version and in the Revised Version there is nothing to indicate in the transliteration of this name that the original exhibits a great peculiarity in the orthography. The name denotes my judge is God, or judge of God and yet it is not pointed and pronounced דניאל Dani-el, according to the analogy of such compounds, but is invariably pointed and pronounced דני־יאל Dani-iel, which obliterates the Divine name 5x El altogether. This is according to the canon laid down in the Massorah that "the Tzere must be under the letter Yod (3) in accordance with the celebrated Codex in the country of Eden".2 Hence this remarkable phenomenon in the MSS, and in the printed editions of the text.

In Hosea X 14 a town is mentioned of the name of Beth-Arbel בית־ארבאל. Leaving the Septuagint which exhibits here the reading οἴκον τοῦ Ιερνβοὰμ = the house of Jeroboam, and confining ourselves to the received text it is admitted that the name in question as we have it in the Massoretic reading denotes House of the ambush of God, i. e. בֵּית־אַרְבַּאֵל. It was, however, deemed offensive to ascribe to God the laying of an ambush. Hence it is pointed and pronounced אַרְבַּאֵל Ar-bel so that the name of God (אֵל) El, is entirely disguised.

In the name Ishmael ישמעאל whom God heareth, we have another instance in which the Divine name El (אל) God is disguised. The reason for it is not far to seek. Besides

י אַלִּיאֵל ז Chron. V 24; VI 19; VIII 20 &c.; אַלִּיאֵל Numb. XIII ווויָאַל ז Chron. XXIII אָלִיאֵל ז Chron. IV 36; IX 12; XXVII 25.

עדן במרינת עדן במרינת מן הוגה על יור הצרי פיישאל במרינת כomp. Orient. 2350, fol. 27a British Museum.

the five passages in which it is the name of three different persons,1 Ishmael occurs forty-three times throughout the Hebrew Bible, twenty times it denotes the first born of Abraham by Hagar² and in no fewer than twenty-three instances it is the name of the murderer of Gedaliah.3 Now it was not so much "the wild ass of a man" whose "hand was against every man, and every man's hand against him" (Gen. XVI 12), but Ishmael the son of Nathaniel who is the cause of the obliteration of אל God, in this compound name. The horrible treachery and villainy which are recorded in Jerem. XL 7-XLI 15 have made his name execrable in the annals of Jewish history and the memory of the massacre which he perpetrated is perpetuated by the fact of the seventh month (Zech. VII 5; VIII 19) which the Iews keep to this day on the third of Tishri. This underlies the punctuation יִשְׁמֵעָאֵל instead of יִשְׁמֵעָאֵל whom God heareth. This punctuation has also been uniformly carried through in all the eight passages in which it is the patronymic, viz. ישמעאלי the Ishmaelite, and indeed in one instance the letter Aleph (x) in the Divine name has been elided altogether (1 Chron. XVII 30).

The obliteration of El (אָל) God, in the compound name יוֹרְעָאֵל God planteth, is probably due to the infamous and bloody deeds perpetrated in Jezreel and to the fact that the final overthrow of the kingdom of Israel took

¹ Comp. Ezra X 22 where Ishmael is the name of a priest who had taken a strange wife; in I Chron. VIII 38; IX 44 it is the name of the sons of Azel; and in 2 Chron. XIX II Ishmael is the name of the father of Zebadiah.

² Comp. Gen. XVI 11, 15, 16; XVII 18, 20, 23, 25, 46; XXV 9, 15, 13, 16, 17; XXVIII 9, 9; XXXVI 3; 1 Chron. I 28, 29, 31.

³ Comp. 2 Kings XXV 23, 25; Jerem. XL 8, 14, 15, 16; XLI 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 9, 10, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18.

⁴ Comp. Gen. XXXVII 25, 27, 28; XXXIX 1; Judg. VIII 24; Ps. LXXXIII 7; 1 Chron. II 17; XXVII 30.

CHAP. XI.

place here.¹ It will be seen that the Divine name is here more effectually disguised than in Ishmael inasmuch as it is always pointed יוֹרְעָאָאל with Segol under the Ayin (צָי) and it is only the patronymic which has Tzere under the Ayin (צֵי). In one instance the Divine name is entirely obliterated by the omission of the letter Aleph (א) in the patronymic where the Keri directs us to insert it. Comp. I Sam. XXX 5.

This reluctance to pronounce the Divine names and the consequent attempts to disguise or to obliterate them have been a fruitful source of various readings. In some Schools of textual critics, the elision of the letter He (7) at the beginning or the addition of the letter Vav (1) at the end of proper names in compounds with Jah (יה), i. e. the abbreviated form of Jehovah (יהוָה), was more extensively carried through than in others. The same was the case with the substitution of Adonaī (אֵדֹנִי) Lord, or Elohim (אֵלהַים) God, for the Tetragrammaton, and with the removal of the vowel-point Tzere from the names in compounds with El (אָל) God. Hence the MSS. frequently exhibit various readings both with regard to the Tetragrammaton and the other names of the God of Israel, as will be seen in the notes to my edition of the Hebrew Bible. This also accounts for the extraordinary phenomenon exhibited in the orthography of the Divine names in the early editions. Thus the editio princeps of the entire Hebrew Bible has Elodim (אלדים) for Elohim (אלדים) God, and Jehodah (יָהוֹדְ) for Jehovah, substituting Daleth (7) for He (7) not only in the pronounceable, but in the unpronounceable name to disguise them both alike. The same process of disguise is adopted in the third edition of the Bible printed at Brescia in 1494.

XII. The attempt to remove the application of the names of false gods to Jehovah. — We have seen that the safe-

¹ Comp. I Kings XXI I-16; 2 Kings IX 23-37; X I-II; Hos. I 4

guarding of the Divine names in the proper names of human beings is the cause of a difference in the orthography. Still, as a rule, the identity of the names and persons is easily recognised. In the anxiety, however, on the part of the Sopherim to prevent the application of the names of idols to the true God, changes have been effected in the text which often preclude the identification of the individual and thus produce apparent contradictions in parallel passages.

The most significant changes are those connected with Baal. The appellative Baal (בעל) which denotes Lord, Owner, like the appellatives Adon (אַדוֹן) Lord, Owner, and El (אל) the Mighty, was originally one of the names of the God of Israel. This is evident from the fact that names compounded with Baal are of frequent occurrence in the families of Saul and David who were zealous defenders of the worship of Jehovah. Thus Eshbaal (אַשָּבַעָל) = the man of Baal or the Lord, is the name of the fourth son of Saul king of Israel (1 Chron. VIII 33; IX 39), and Beeliada (בעלידע) = for whom Baal or the Lord careth, is the name of the son of David born in Jerusalem (1 Chron. XIV 7). As names were given by parents with special reference to God in recognition of mercies vouchsafed, it will hardly be contended that both Saul and David dedicated their children to the false God Baal and not to the true God of Israel. We also find that one of David's heroes who joined his army at Ziklag was called Bealjah (בעליה) = whose Baal or Lord is Jehovah (1 Chron. XII 5), and that one of David's chief officers was called Baal-hanan (בַּעַל־חַבָּן) = Baal or the Lord of mercy (1 Chron. XXVII 28).

But Baal was also the name of the supreme deity of the surrounding nations who in conjunction with Asherah was afterwards worshipped with obscene rites. Prior to the

¹ Comp. 1 Kings XVIII 19; 2 Kings XXIII 4.

Babylonish captivity the Jews were frequently seduced by this libidinous form of idolatry and introduced Kedeshim and Kedeshoth into their worship.1 During their exile, however, they were completely weaned from going astray after other gods and on their return to the Holy Land under Ezra and Nehemiah every effort was made by the spiritual guides of the people to obliterate if possible the very name of the idols whose worship was associated with licentiousness. Hence Jehovah himself in describing the purified state of religion declares: "It shall come to pass at that day that thou shalt call me Ishi [= my husband] and shalt call me no more Baali [= my Baal or Lord]: for I will take away the names of Baalim out of her mouth and they shall no more be mentioned by their names" (Hosea II 16, 17). It is due to this declaration that the authoritative custodians of the sacred text interpreted the precept "and make no mention of the names of other gods" (Exod. XXIII 13) in a most rigid sense as implying that the very name of Baal should be cancelled even in compound proper names. For this reason names compounded with Baal have been altered either in a good sense or principally by way of ridicule into compounds with Bosheth (בּשָׁת) = shame. Thus

(וֹרֶבַּעֵּלִי) = Baal contends, the name which was given to Gideon by his father Joash when the people wished to kill him, and which occurs fourteen times,² is altered in 2 Sam. XI 21 into

Jerubbesheth (יְרֶבְּשֶׁת) = with whom shame contends, i. e. the shameful idol. The fact that the Septuagint, the Syriac and the Vulgate exhibit here יְרַבַּעֵל Jerubbaal, shows that

¹ Comp. I Kings XIV 22-24; XV 12; XXII 47; 2 Kings XXIII 7; Hos. IV 14; with Numb. XXV 1-3; XXXI 16; Josh. XXII 17.

² Comp. Judg. VI 32; VII 1; VIII 29, 35; IX 1, 2, 5, 5, 16, 19, 24, 28, 57; I Sam. XII 11.

they had still a recension before them in which this alteration had not been made, or that the Codex from which these Versions were made belonged to a School which retained the ancient reading.

(2) Eshbaal (אֶשְׁבַּעֵל) = the man of Baal, the name of the fourth son of Saul king of Israel which occurs twice (1 Chron. VIII 33; IX 39), is altered into

Ish-bosheth (איש־בּשׁה) = the man of shame, in all the other twelve passages where it occurs.¹

(3) Ashbel (אַשָׁבֶּל) = the man of Baal, the second or third son of Benjamin which occurs three times, viz. Gen. XLVI 21; Numb. XXVI 38; 1 Chron. VIII 1, is altered into

Jediael (יְרֵישָאֵל) = known of God, in the other three instances where this name occurs for the son of Benjamin, viz. 1 Chron. VII 6, 10, 11. It will be seen that in the case of this name the alteration is in a good sense.

(4) Merib-baal (מֶרִיב בַּעֵל) = my Lord Baal, the name of Jonathan's lame son and Saul's grandson as he is three times called, viz. I Chron. VIII 34, 34; IX 40, but more properly Meri-baal (מֵרִיבּעַל) in I Chron. IX 40, is altered into

Mephibosheth (מָּפִיבשָׁת) = the exterminator of shame, in all the other fourteen passages where it occurs² thus making it denote the very reverse of its original meaning. Mephibosheth also occurs once as the name of a son of Saul by his concubine Rizpah the daughter of Aiah (2 Sam. XXI 8). It is, therefore, to be presumed that it is also an alteration from Meri-baal.

(5) Beeliada (בְּעֶלְיְרֶע) = whom Baal or the Lord knows, i. e. cares for, the name of a son of David which only occurs once in the first List, viz. I Chron. XIV 7, is altered into

¹ Comp. 2 Sam. II 8, 10, 12, 15; III 7, 8, 14, 15; IV 5, 8, 8, 12.

² Comp. 1 Sam. IV 4; IX 6, 6, 10, 11, 12, 12, 13; XVI 1, 4; XIX 24,

^{25, 30;} XXI 7.

Eliada (אֶלְיָדֶע) = whom God knows, i. e. cares for, in the other two Lists which repeat the names of David's sons born in Jerusalem contained in 2 Sam. V 14—16 and 1 Chron. III 5—8.

(6) 2 Sam. XXIII 8. — The most remarkable instance of confusion, however, which has been produceed in the Massoretic text by this anxiety on the part of the Sopherim "to take away the names of Baalim" (comp. Hos. II 17) is exhibited in 2 Sam. XXIII 8. In the List of David's chief heroes which is repeated three times, viz. (1) 2 Sam. XXIII 8-39; (2) 1 Chron. XI 11-41; and (3) 1 Chron. XXVII 2-15, the name of the first hero who heads this catalogue is given in 2 Sam. XXIII 8 as ישׁב בשבת הַחְבּמני. This extraordinary name is rendered in the Authorised Version the Tachmonite that sat in the seat, with the alternative in the margin "Or, Josheb-bassebet the Tachmonite". This curious marginal rendering is inserted into the text of the Revised Version with the remark against it in the margin "the verse is probably corrupt. See I Chron. XI II". The corruption, however, which is here acknowledged is simply confirmed by the parallel Lists, but cannot be corrected by them. It is the Septuagint which supplies the clue to the correction since it exhibits the reading 'Iεβοσθε = יִשְׁבּשֶׁת Ishbosheth, i. e. the man of shame, which is also the name of the fourth son of Saul. But as Ishbosheth itself, as we have seen, is already an alteration of the original name אשבעל or אשבעל Ishbaal, i. e. the man of Baal, there can hardly be any doubt that it was the primitive reading here. This is attested by the Lucian recension of the Septuagint which has $I_{\epsilon}\sigma\beta\alpha\alpha\lambda =$ ישבעל Ishbaal. With these facts before us we at once see that the name of this first hero in the parallel catalogues must also have been originally ישבעל Ishbaal, and indeed the Lucian recension of the Septuagint has actually 'IEGGE- הממא = ישׁבַּעל in 1 Chron. XI 11 and B. has 'Ιεσαβαδα which is probably an error for 'Ιεσεβαλα. In the Hebrew the name was probably written both in 1 Chron. XI 11 and XXVII 2 ישבעל which was resolved by one School into 'ישבעל 'Ishbaal, and by another School disguised into 'שבעם' Joshobam. Whether the Levite ישבעם, the descendant of Korah whose name is once mentioned in 1 Chron. XII 6, was originally also ישבעל, or whether this name has made it easier for the redactors of the text to resolve 'שבעל in 1 Chron. XI 11; XII 2 it is now difficult to ascertain.

XIII. Safeguarding the unity of the Divine Worship at Jerusalem. — To understand the anxiety of the spiritual guides of the Jewish Commonwealth to guard against any rival to the central Sanctuary at Jerusalem, and the effect which this solicitude has had upon the redaction of the text it is necessary to advert to the events in the history of the Jews during this period.

During the terrible wars which raged in Palestine between the Jews and the Syrians and the consequent persecutions B. C. 164, Onias IV, the young son of Onias III, the legitimate High Priest, fled to Alexandria accompanied by Dositheus who was likewise of priestly descent. As Onias III had always espoused the cause of the Egyptians against the Syrians, Ptolemy Philometor received his son with great hospitality. Egypt, however, was then distracted by intestine war. The brothers Philometor and Physcon, were arrayed against each other in deadly conflict fighting for the crown. Onias and Dositheus sided with the former and became generals of divisions. Through their high position and influence they were

¹ Comp. Josephus, Antiq. XIII 3, 1-3; Wars VII 10, 3; Against Apion II 5.

followed by the Egyptian Jews into the battle-field and greatly contributed to the success of Philometor over Physicon. As a reward for his services Philometor made Onias prince over the Jewish community in Egypt with the hereditary title of Ethnarch and Alabarch.

As prince over the community, Onias was determined to build a Temple for his numerous Jewish brethren who had settled in Egypt since the Sanctuary at Jerusalem had been profaned, and Alcimus, a usurping High Priest, was politically appointed over the heads of the legitimate priestly family. Being a descendant of that long line of High Priests, whose family dated from the time of David and Solomon, who officiated in the first Temple and who exerted themselves in the building of the Second Temple after the return from the Babylonish captivity, Onias IV was not suspected of schism and hence was greatly encouraged by his brethren in his contemplated design. He, moreover, pointed out a prophecy which foretold that a Temple should be built in Egypt (Isa. XIX 19). When Onias made his design known to Philometer this monarch forthwith gave him a plot of land at Leontopolis, in the Prefecture of Heliopolis for the site of the Temple. He also assigned the revenues of the whole of this province for the permanent maintenance of the divine service. And it thus came to pass that in the vicinity of Goshen, on almost the identical spot where the descendants of Jacob had light when the rest of Egypt was suffering from the plague of darkness, so many centuries before, the Israelites had now a Temple wherein they worshipped the God of Abraham for more than two hundred years (circa B. C. 160-A. D. 71), when it was closed by the decree of Vespasian.

The Jerusalem Jews, who during the distracted state of Judea and the profanation of the Sanctuary in the metropolis received the tidings of the building of the Temple in Egypt with joy, were afterwards extremely jealous of its existence when the Temple at Jerusalem had been purified and when its true worship was restored by the Maccabeans, since the new Sanctuary in Egypt disturbed the central point of unity. The Alexandrian Jews, however, to whom this new Temple had been a great comfort when the metropolitan Sanctuary was profaned, clung to their sacred edifice most tenaciously. Hence the alterations by the redactors of the Hebrew text of any passage which might favour the Egyptian Temple, as will be seen from the following illustration.

Isa. XIX 18. — This verse as it now stands in the textus receptus is correctly translated in the Authorised Version:

In that day shall five cities in the land of Egypt speak the language of Canaan, and swear to the Lord of hosts; one shall be called, the city of destruction.

The whole of this Section (XIX 18-25) predicts the glorious future of the five Egyptian cities when they shall use the sacred language in which the worship of God is conducted and when they shall swear fealty to Jehovah. And now we are told that the most distinguished of these cities thus converted and consecrated and dedicated in so special a manner to the worship of Jehovah is to be called City of Destruction, which is a perfect contradiction to the whole tenor of the passage in question. The Septuagint, however, solves the difficulty inasmuch as it clearly shows that the Hebrew recension from which it was made read City of Righteousness (πόλις ἀσεδέκ = עיר הצרק). From a pious desire not to bring the name of any other place in competition or even in juxtaposition with the sacred city the metropolis of the Holy Land, the Alexandrian translators of the Septuagint, as is often the case, did not venture to translate the word at all, but simply transliterated it. The Palestinian redactors, however, who were jealous for the distinction of Jerusalem which bore this name (comp. Isa. I 26) would not consent that this title should be given to any other place, especially out of Palestine.

Hence they substituted for it "the City of the Sun", which is still to be found in the most ancient traditions,1 in many MSS., in some of the ancient Versions and in the margins both of the Authorised Version and the Revised Version. But afterward when the Jerusalem Temple was cleansed of its pollutions and the true service of Jehovah was restored, the Onias Temple was not only deemed unnecessary, but schismatic, another School of textual critics altered the name "City of the Sun" or Heliopolis, into the opprobrious name "City of Destruction". This was done all the more easily since it simply exhibited a kind of alliteration, which is very common in Hebrew, and only required the slightest change in a letter, or the exchange of two letters Cheth (17) and He (17) which are almost identical in form and are frequently mistaken for each other both in the MSS, and in the editions of the Hebrew text.2

¹ Comp. Menachoth 110a, so also Symmachus, the Vulgate and the Chaldee. The latter, however, exhibits both recensions Dan sun and Dan destruction, inasmuch as it paraphrases it the City of Beth-shemesh [= dwelling of the sun, Heliopolis] which is to be destroyed, shall one of them be called קרתא בית שמש דעתידא למחרב יתאמר היא חדא מנהון.

² How difficult it is to justify this reading which is followed by Aquila, Theodotion and the Syriac may be seen from the expedient to which Kimchi was driven in the interpretation of the passage. It shall be said to one of them City of Destruction, that is, they will all so cling to the faith of the true God that they will agree together that in case one of the five cities should forsake the worship of God it shall be said to her City of Destruction, i. e. the others will rise up against her and destroy her כל the others will rise up against her and destroy her כך יהיו דבקים באמונת האל עד שיםכימו ביניהם שאם תשוב מעבורת האל אחת מחמש ערים יאמר לה עיר ההרם כלומר שיעמידו עליה ויהרסוה.

It will be seen that the formulization of these principles and the redaction of the text in accordance with them, presuppose functions which really belong to revisers rather than editors. But no exception can be taken to the conduct of these divinely appointed depositories of the traditional text. In accepting their transliteration of the text into the present square characters, their division of it into separate words, verses and sections, their orally transmitted pronunciation of the consonants which determines the sense of the Hebrew Scriptures and their finally fixing the canon of the Old Testament, we already concede to these spiritual guides of the Jewish Church a divine authority which almost amounts to co-authorship. Their specific authority, however, as textual revisers ceased about a century before Christ and there can hardly be any doubt that the received text which we now have is substantially the same which was finally settled at that period by these authoritative redactors. Copies of these authorised Scriptures were deposited in the Court of the Temple and these were not only used for public reading, but as Standard Codices whereby other MSS, were corrected. Thus we are told in the Jerusalem Talmud (Taanith IV 2):

Three Codices [of the Pentateuch] were in the Court of the Temple, Codex Meon, Codex Zaatute and Codex Hi. In one the reading was מעונה refuge [Deut. XXXIII 27], and the other two Codices read מעונה [with the final He], the reading of the two was accepted and that of the one Codex was rejected. One Codex read ועמומי $[=\xi\eta\tau\eta\tau\eta s]$ enquires of [Exod. XXIV 5] and the other two Codices read ישני young men of, the reading of the two Codices was accepted and that of the one Codex was rejected. In one Codex the reading [with Yod] occurred nine times and in the other two Codices it occurred eleven times, the reading of the two Codices was accepted and that of the one Codex was rejected.

נ' מפרים מצאו בעזרה ספר מעוני? [מעון] וספר זעמוטי וספר היא כאחד מצאו כתוב מעון אלהי קדם ובשנים כתוב מענה אלהי קדם וקיימו שנים וביטלו אחר. באחד מצאו כתוב וישלח את זעטוטי בני ישראל ובשנים כתוב וישלח את נערי בני

This notice reveals to us the important fact that the Codices in question must have been completed anterior to the introduction of the Five Final Letters when the orthography in Deut. XXXIII 27 was still מעונ which one School of textual critics read מעונ , whilst another School read it מעונה = מעונה. After the Final Letters were legally established, this variation could not have obtained since the final Nun (1) determines the length of the word.

It, moreover, shows that at this early period the linguistic peculiarities were already counted. In the Pentateuch where the pronoun third person singular with Vav occurs about 656 times, and where it is used 457 times for the masculine gender and 199 times for the feminine, we are told that the majority of the Temple Codices read with Yod (') in eleven passages.

But what is most instructive in this classical record is the fact that we are here told for the first time that the redactors of the text at this period collated MSS. and that they decided in favour of the reading which the majority of Codices exhibited. In selecting, however, the reading which was found in the larger number of Codices they did not destroy the variant of the minority and have thus enabled us to test the merit of the rejected reading. We have already seen that in other instances too, where the official reading is given in the margin, the stigmatized words are not obliterated, but left in the text, though the redactors do not specify the exact process by which they arrived at their conclusions.

The classical record of these Temple Codices, however, by no means implies that there were no other MSS. in the precincts of the Sanctuary or that the instances adduced exhausted the variations. Josephus tells us that Titus

presented him with Codices of the Sacred Scriptures from the spoils of the Temple, and we know that there were others in the possession of distinguished doctors of the Law, which exhibited readings at variance with the present textus receptus. In the course of this examination we shall have occasion to refer to the readings in the Codex of R. Meir, the celebrated desciple of R. Akiba which are so often quoted both in the Talmud and in the Midrashim.

In the Midrash attributed to R. Moses Ha-Darshan at Narbonne, which was compiled before A. D. 1280, and the MS. of which is now in the possession of the Jewish community at Prague, a List is given of thirty-two various readings taken from a copy of the Pentateuch which was carried away by the Romans after the capture of Jerusalem. Josephus records that among the trophies which Vespasian brought from the Temple to Rome was the Law of the Jews. This he ordered to be deposited in the royal palace circa 70 A. D. About 220 A. D. the emperor Severus who built a synagogue at Rome which was called after his name, handed over this MS. to the Jewish community, and though both the synagogue and the MS. have perished, a List of variations from this ancient Codex has been preserved. This List I printed in my Massorah from the able article by the learned Mr. Epstein.2 Since then I have found a duplicate of this List in a MS. of the Bible in the Paris National Library No. 31 (folio 399a) where it is appended as a Massoretic Rubric.3 The List in this

¹ Comp. Josephus, Life § 75.

² Comp. Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums, Vol. XXXIV, p. 337-351, Krotoschin 1885; with The Massorah, Vol. III, p. 348.

³ This List is also printed in the *Monatsschrift*, Vol. XXXVI, p. 508, Krotoschin 1887. Comp. Neubauer, *Studia Biblica*, Vol. III, p. 19 &c, Oxford 1891.

Codex, though consisting of the same number of variations and enumerated almost in the same order, differs materially from the one preserved in the Midrash as will be seen from the following analysis of the two records, exhibits the primitive Rubric. The heading of the Paris List is as follows:1

These verses which were written in the Pentateuch Codex found in Rome and carefully preserved and locked up in the Synagogue of Severus, differ as regards letters and words.

(1) Gen. I 31. — Instead of "behold it was very good" the text read "behold death was good". That this reading was not confined to the Severus Codex is evident from the record in the Midrash Rabba on this passage where we are told that the Codex of the celebrated R. Meir also read it death (מות) instead of very (מאד) and Rashi

י אלין פסוקיא דהוו כתיבין בספר אוריתא דאישתכה ברומי והיא גנוזה יסתומא בכנשתא דסירום בשנוי אותיות ותיבות: וירא אלהים את כל אשר עשה והנה מוב מאר, מות היה כתוב: כתנות עוד וילבשם, כתנוד היה כתוב: הכצעקתה הבאה אלי עשו כלה, הכצעקתם היה כתוב: ויאמר יי אלהי אדני אברהם, ומארע היה כתוב: וימכר את בכורתו ליעקב, מכרתו היה כתוב: הנה נא זקנתי, יוממתי היה כתוב: ראה ריח בני כריח שדה, סדה היה כתוב: יעוש רואהליבמה ילדה, יעיש היה כתוב: וכז רואלה היו בני יעוש, יעוש היה כתוב: ויקומו וירדו מצרימה, מצרים היה כתוב: אליפו בן עדה, בנעדה היה כתוב: וישימני לאב לפרעה, פרעה היה כתוב: ואקברה שם, שמ׳ היה כתוב: ואלה שמות בני ישראל הבאים מצרימה, מצרים היה כתוב: ויסעו בני ישראל מרעמסס, מרעמס׳ היה כתוב: כה תאמר לבית יעקב ותניד לבני ישראל, לבית היה כתוב תרויהו": וחמשה בריחים לקרשי, לא היה כתוב בריחים: ולקח הכהן מרם, מדמ׳ היה כתוב: וכי ירק הזב, במים חיים היה כתוב: וכבשה אחת בת שנתה תמימה. תמימים היה כתוב: כל בא לצבא דקהת, הבא היה כתוב: מראשית עריסותיכם לדרתיכם, לדריכם היה כתוב: נקם נקמת בני ישראל מאת המדינים אחר תאסף, אשר היה כתוב: ויבאו אל משה ואל כל עדת. לא היה כתוב בו כל: ויקרבו ראשי בני יוסף. בן יוסף היה כתוב: ולא אביתם לעלות, אביתמי היה כתוב: ויעשו גם הם, המי היה כתוב: לתת אותנו ביד האמרי, האמור היה כתוב: לא תקה האם על הבנים, האבנים היה בתוב: נפרית ומלח שרפה, שרפת היה כתוב: כמהפכת אלהים את סדום, כמפכת היה כתו': אמרתי אפאיהם, אף אי הם היה כתוב: ויבא מורה צדק במהרה בימינו, ויאמר לנו.

 2 מות של הנה מוב מאר כתוב והנה מצא בתורתו של הבי מאר MidrashRabba, Parasha IX, fol. 24b, ed. Wilna 1878.

(1040—1105), in his gloss on the Midrash so far from taking exception to this reading, adduces Eccl. VII 9 in supporting it. The variant (מות היה כתוב) is inadvertently omitted in the Prague recension of this List. This is also attested by Kimchi in his Commentary on this passage.¹

- (2) Gen. III 21. According to this List the reading of the Severus Codex in the passage before us was simply "and the Lord God made unto Adam and to his wife coats", without specifying the material of which the said garments consisted. Here again the Prague List which adduces the same catchword does not give the variant. From the Midrash Rabba on this passage we learn that the Codex of R. Meir exhibited here another variant. Instead of "coats of skin" (אור) this celebrated Codex read "coats of light" (אור), i. e. luminous, bright or precious coats, having Aleph (אור) instead of Ayin (אור)² and Onkelos appears to support this reading.³
- (3) Gen. XVIII 21. Instead of "according to the cry of it" (הכצעקה) with the suffix third person singular feminine, the Severus Codex read "according to their cry" (הכצעקה) with the suffix third person plural masculine. This is manifestly the primitive and better reading as is evident from המאקם their sin, in the preceding verse and as is attested by Onkelos, the Jerusalem Targum and the Septuagint.
- (4) Gen. XXIV 7. In the passage before us the Prague List has preserved the proper catchword and the more

נוזא היתה והיא האשתביאת האישתביאת גניוא היתה נוזא היתה מצאתי בתוב באותיב האישתביאת למות בתוב בהוח והוא היתה מכתום והנה שוב מותב מכתום והנה של היש בתוב בתנות אור אלו בנדי אדם הראשון שהן דומים בתנות אור אלו בנדי אדם הראשון שהן דומים במחות ברין מלמעלה: Comp. Midrash Rabba, Parasha XX, folio 47a, ed. Wilna 1878.

³ כתנוך in the List of the Paris National Library is manifestly a clerical error for התנות.

correct variant exhibited in the Severus Codex. According to this Rubric the Severus Codex had here "who took me from my house and from my country" (מַבִּיתִי וֹמַבְּיתִי וֹבְיתִּי וֹמַבְּיתִי וֹבְיתִי וֹמַבְיתִי וֹבְיתִי וֹמַבְּיתִי וֹבְיתִי וְבִּיתִי וְבִּיתְי שוֹבְיתִי וּבְּבְיתִי וּבְּיתִי וְבִּיתִּי וְבִּיתִי וְבִּיתִי וְבִּיתִּי וְבִּיתִּי וְבִּיתִי וְבִּיתִּי וְבִּיתִּי וְבִּיתִּי וְבִּיתִי וְבִּיתְּי וְבִּיתִי וְבִּיתִּי וְבִּיתְי וְבִּיתִי וְבִּיתִי וְבִּיתְי וְבְּיתִי וְבִּיתִי וְבִּיתְי וְבְּבְּיתִי וְבְּבְיתִּי וְבְּבְיתִי וְבְּבְּיתְי וְבִּיתְי וְבִּיתְי וְבִּיתְי וְבִּיתְי וְבִּיתְי וְבִּיתְי וְבִּיתְּי וְבִּבְּיִּבְּיִּ וְבְּיִבְּיִי וְבִּיְיִי וְבִּיְיִי וְבְּבְּיִי וְבְּבְּיִי וְבְּיִי בְּיִיבְּיִבְּיִי וְבְּבְּיִי וְבְּבְּיִי וְבְּבְּיִי וְבְּבְּיִי וְבְּיִי וְבְּבְיִי וְבְּיִיתְי וְבְּיִי וְבְּיִי וְבְּבְּיִי וְבְּיִי וְבְּיִי וּבְּיי וְבְּיִי וְבְּיִי וְבְּיִי וְבְּיִי וְבְּיִי וְבְּיִי וְבְּיִי וְבְּיי וְבְּיִי וְבְּיִי וְבְּיִי וְבְּיִי וְבְּיִי וְבְּבְיי וְבְּיִי וְבְּיִי וְבְּיִי וְבְּיִי וְבְּיִי וְבְּיִי וְבְּייִי וְבְּיִייִי וְבְּיִייְיִי וְבְּיִייִי וְבְּיִייִי וְבְּייִייִיי וְיִייִייְ וְבְּייִי וְבְּייִייִייְיי וְבְּייִיי וְבְּייִי וְבְּייִייְיי וְבְייִי וְבְּייִייְייי וְבְּייִייְיי וְבְּייִייְיי וְבְּיייִייְייי וְבְּייִייְיי וְבְּיייִיי וְּבְּייי וְבְּייִייי וְבְּבְּיייי וְבְּבְייי וְבְּבְייי וְבְּבְיייי וְבְּבְּייי וְבְּבְּייי וְבְּבְיייי וְבְּבְּייי וְבְּבְיייי וְבְּבְּייי וְבְּבְייי וְבְּבְּבְייי וְבְּבְּייי וְּבְּבְייי וְבְּבְּייִיי וְיּבְּבְייי וְיּבְּבְייי וּבְּבְייִיי וּבְּבְייִי וְיּבְייי וְיּבְּבְייי וְבְּבְיייִיי וְבְּבְּייי וְיּבְּבְייי וְיוֹיי וְייִייי וְיּבְי

- (5) Gen. XXV 33. The Severus Codex read here "and he sold his ware" (מכרתו) or price, instead of his birth-right (בכרתו).
- (6) Gen. XXVII 2. The reading here in the Severus Codex, though yielding no difference in the sense from that in the textus receptus, is of great orthographical interest inasmuch as it exhibits the primitive text prior to the division of the words and to the introduction of the final letters. In the Prague recension of this List these features have been obliterated through a clerical error. For a similar instance which exhibits the same orthographical features see below No. 11.
- (7) Gen. XXVII 7. The value of the variation here consists in the fact that it discloses to us a period in the orthography of the text when in the absence of the diacritical mark which now distinguishes Shin (v) from Sin (v) the letter Samech (v) was more frequently used by some Schools of textual critics. In the Prague recension of the List the point in question is obliterated through a clerical error.
- (8 and 9) Gen. XXXVI 5, 14. The variation here affects the orthography of the proper Name Jeūsh (ישוש). This name which occurs nine times in the Bible is spelled

in two different ways. In six passages it is Jeūsh (שִּישׁי) with Vav,¹ and in three instances the textual reading or the Kethiv is Jeūsh (שִּישׁי) with Yod,² for which the official reading or the Keri substitutes שִּישׁי Jeūsh with Vav to make it conformable to the six instances. Now according to the Severus Codex the textual reading in both these instances was שִׁישׁי Jeūsh with Yod and without the official Keri. According to the Prague recension, however, the textual reading in both passages was שׁישׁי Jeūsh with Vav.

(10) Gen. XLIII 15. — This variation refers to the presence and absence of the local He (7) in the word מצרים Egypt. Trite as the difference may seem it discloses to us the orthographical changes which the text underwent in the different Schools of textual critics. The Rubric distinctly tells us that the Severus Codex read it here מצרים Egypt, without the local He (ה) in contradistinction to the acknowledged MSS. which read it מצרימה with He. In our present textus receptus, however, the textual reading is now מצרים as it is in the Severus Codex and it is only the Sevir according to the Massorah which has מצרימה with He.3 We thus see that according to the testimony of the Severus Codex the present Sevir was originally the textual reading. The Prague List gives simply the catchword without specifying the variation. This has misled the learned editor who takes it for Gen. XLVI 6 and hence concluded that the Severus Codex read it here ויקומו וירדו and they rose up and went down, instead of the simple וַיַבֹאוּ and they come. For a similar variation see below No. 14.

(11) Gen. XXXVI 10. — Here again the variation is of great orthographical interest. The Codex Severus we

¹ Comp. Gen. XXXVI 18; I Chron. I 35; VII 39; XXIII 10, 11; ² Chron. XI 19

² Comp. Gen. XXXVI 5, 14; 1 Chron. VII 10.

³ Comp. The Massorah, letter 2, § 700, Vol. II, p. 242.

are told, read בּן־עָּדְה the son of Adah, as one word, viz. which is a survival of the primitive text prior to the division of the words and the introduction of the final letters. For a similar instance see above No. 6. The Prague List simply gives the catchword without specifying the variation which has again misled the erudite editor who takes it to refer to Gen. XXXVI 12 where he thinks that the Severus Codex read אליפו בן עדה Eliphaz the son of Adah, instead of אליפו בן עשו Eliphaz the son of Esau.

(12) Gen. XLV 8. — The Severus Codex read here "and he made me אָאַב פַּרְעוֹה a father of Pharaoh", instead of a father to Pharaoh אָאַב לְּבָּרְעוֹה . This variant makes no difference in the sense and the reading in the Severus Codex is simply according to the construction in Gen. XVII 4. According to the Prague recension, however, the variation consists in the Severus Codex having read ושונים and he lent me, from ושונים to lend, instead of ושונים and he made me, from שונים to put, to make. This was also the reading of R. Meir's Codex.¹ It is probable that the Prague recension has here adopted the reading of R. Meir's Codex as the compiler of the List was not certain about the real variation in the Severus List.

(13) Gen. XLVIII 7. — Here again the variation exhibits the survival of the primitive orthography inasmuch as it shows that the Severus Codex still retained the

בספרו של ר' מאיר כתוב וישני לאב שנאמר אשר ישה ברעהו דין הוא מן מליא בספרו של ר' מאיר כתוב וישני לאב שנאמר אשר ישה ברעהו דין הוא מן מליא בכנישתא דכתיבן באוריתא דנפקת מן ירושלם בשביתא וסלקת לרומי והות נניוא בכנישתא in the Codex of R. Meir the reading was and he lent me as a father, as it is written 'every one who lendeth to his neighbour' [Deut. XV 2]. This is one of the words which were written in the Codex that went from Jerusalem into exile and departed to Rome, and was deposited in the Synagogue of Asverus. Comp. the Prague Midrash Rabba on Gen. XLV 8 and Epstein in the Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums, Vol. XXXIV, p. 339, Krotoschin 1885.

416

spelling by there, with what we now call the medial Mem (2) at the end of the word, instead of the final Mem (2) which obtained at a later period. For a similar instance see below No. 26. The Prague recension of this List simply gives the catchword of the verse in which the variant occurs without stating what it is. This has caused Mr. Epstein to enter into a learned disquisition as to the probable nature of the variant.

- (14) Gen. XLVI 8. The variation here is exactly the same as that exhibited in No. 10 and affords another instance of the absence of the local He (ה) in the primitive orthography. Originally it was מַצְרִיִּם which one School afterwards read מַצְרִיִּם = מִצְרִיִם and the other School read it מַצְרִיִם = מִצְרִיִם . Hence the origin of the Rubric which tabulates the Sevirin on the diversity of the orthography of this proper name as well as the Massorah which registers the number of instances where it is spelled מַצְרִיִּמָה with the local He. The simple catchword in the Prague recension without the variant itself has again called forth a learned and conjectural note from the editor as to the reading in the Severus Codex which is set aside by the explicit statement in the Paris List.
- (15) Exod. XII 37. Nothing can be more clear than the declaration in the Paris List as to the precise nature of the variant here. The Severus Codex we are told had the abbreviation 'ברעמס from Rames, instead of the full expression ברעמס from Rameses. This important statement yields an additional proof that abbreviations were originally used in the Hebrew Scriptures. The absence of the variant in the Prague recension has again produced a learned note from the editor which is rendered nugatory by the explicit statement here.

¹ Comp. The Massorah, letter 2, §§ 700, 703, Vol II, p 242.

² Vide supra, chap. IV, p. 163-170.

- (ולבני) Exod. XIX 3. Instead of "and tell the children of (לבני) Israel" the Severus Codex read it "and tell the house of (לבני) Israel", thus having the same expression in both clauses of the verse. That the phrases לבני ישַׂרָאֵל the children of Israel, and בִּית ישֵּׂרְאֵל the house of Israel, frequently interchanged in the Codices is evident both from the ancient Versions and the Massorah. This is the reason why the Massorites found it necessary to fix the instances in which the respective phrases occurred in the Bible according to the Standard MSS. from which their Lists are compiled. In the Prague recension the expressions לבני and לבני are simply transposed.
- (נְרָיִהְם) Exod. XXVI 27. In the textus receptus the expression bars (בְּרִיהְם) occurs twice. The Severus Codex, however, had it only once. It omitted it in the second clause and simply read "and five" (תַּבְּשָׁה) as it is in the preceding verse. The Prague recension gives the same variation.
- (18) Levit. IV 34. According to our List the Severus Codex read here מום. This may either be an abbreviation of אָרָהָה from its blood, which would make the variation to consist in the reading of אָרָה from its blood, instead of from the blood of the sin offering, thus making it comformable to verse 30 where exactly the same phrase is used. Or the variation simply consists in exhibiting the primitive orthography of the so-called medial Mem (מוֹ) at the end of the word as is the case in Gen. XLVIII 7 marked here No. 13. The Prague recension favours the former. In either case, however, we have here an important orthographical contribution. According to the former we have another instance where the primitive text exhibited.

¹ Comp. The Massorah, letter 3, §§ 254—256, 363, Vol. I, pp. 179, 180, 186.

418 Introduction.

abbreviations, whilst according to the latter the medial letters were still used at the end of words. For a similar instance see below No. 27.

- (20) Levit. XIV 10. The Severus Codex read אַמְימָה without blemish, the plural in both clauses of this verse and not אָמִימָה the singular in the second clause as it is in the received text.
- (21) Numb. IV 3. The phrase "all that enter into the host" occurs five times in this chapter. In four instances the verb in this combination has the article, viz. אַבָּא (IV 30, 35, 39, 43), whilst in one single instance it is אַבָּא without the article (IV 3) in the received text. Now the Severus Codex read it also here אַבָּא with the article and there can hardly be any doubt that this is the correct reading.
- (22) Numb. XV 21. The Severus Codex read here לְּדְרְמֶיכֶם in your generation, in the singular instead of יוֹ אַרְמִיכֶּם in your generations, the plural as it is in the received text. The singular noun with suffix second person plural does not occur in the present Massoretic text.
- (23) Numb. XXXI 2. After quoting the words "avenge the children of Israel of the Midianites" [= Numb. XXXI 2] the Paris List states that the text of the Severus Codex had here אשר היה which was. But where this phrase is to be inserted or for which words in the verse it is to be substituted it is difficult to say. The Prague recension does not afford us the slightest assistance. The note of the editor is beside the mark and totally ignores the

expression אשר which follows the catchword and which is not in the received text.

- (24) Numb. XXX 12. Instead of "and unto all the congregation", the Severus Codex had simply "and unto the congregation" without 52 all. This variant is exceedingly interesting inasmuch as it shows that the particle in question was in the then received text from which the reading in the Severus Codex differed. And though it is absent in the present Massoretic text, many MSS. and the ancient Version support the statement in this List as will be seen from the note on this passage in my edition of the Bible. Our present textus receptus, therefore, follows the reading of the Severus Codex. The Prague recension simply gives the catchword without the variant which has again misled the erudite editor.
- (25) Numb. XXXVI 1. For "the sons of Joseph" the Severus Codex read "the son of Josephus". The Syriac also exhibits the singular which derives support from verse 12.
- (26) Deut. I 26. The variant here exhibits another instance of the survival of the primitive orthography prior to the introduction of the final letters. Whilst the then current text read ולא אביתם and ye would not, with final Mem (ב), the Severus Codex had it still אביתם with what is now called the medial Mem (ב). For a similar instance see above No. 13.
- (27) Deut. III 20. We are expressly told that the Severus Codex read it hey, which may either be an abbreviation of high, the same plural pronoun with paragogic He (17) as it is in Josh. I 15, or it may exhibit another instance of the primitive orthography prior to the introduction of the final letters. In either case we have here an important contribution to the ancient orthography similar in character to the one in No. 18

- (28) Deut. I 27. According to our List the Severus Codex read here האמור the Amorite, the abbreviated form instead of the fully written out, whilst according to the Prague recension the Severus Codex read it האמורים in the plural which does not occur in the Hebrew Bible.
- (29) Deut. XXII 6. Instead of "thou shall not take the dam with (הבנים) the young" the Severus Codex read it "thou shalt not take the dam upon (האבנים) the laying nest", i. e. before she has finished laying her complement of eggs, the same expression which occurs in Exod. I 16.
- (30) Deut. XXIX 22. Instead of words as it is in the received text the Severus Codex read it which is simply a difference in form and does not affect the sense of the passage. The Prague recension exhibits the same variation.
- (31) Deut. XXIX 22. In the same verse the Severus Codex read מוֹל like the over throw, without the He (ה) instead of שמות which is simply an orthographical variation without altering the sense. The Prague recension does not give this instance.
- (32) Deut. XXXII 26. Instead of אפאיהם I will scatter them afar, or I will blow upon them, the Hiphil future first person singular with the suffix third person plural, from למאה to breathe, to blow, the Severus Codex read it in three words אך אי הם I said in anger where are they? This division of the single expression into three distinct words is also exhibited in the Chaldee and in the Siphri.¹ The Severus Codex has, therefore, preserved the ancient traditional reading which obtained in one School of textual critics.

י Comp. Onkelos יחול רונוי עליהון and the Siphri אברתי באצי איה הם. אמרתי באצי איה הם and the Siphri אבי הם. The Samaritan divides it into two words אפי הם they are mine anger, i. e. they are the object or cause of mine anger, so also the Syriac which renders it איכה אכון אפא הם איכה אכון אפא שורפי איכה אכון אינה אינון אפא שורפי אינה אנון אינו אינון אפא אינון אינ

It will be seen from the last line of this List that so far from being regarded with indifference, the Massorite expresses the pious hope that the Righteous Teacher, i. e. the Prophet Elias who alone will solve all difficulties, and whose speedy advent is anxiously expected, will decide whether these readings are to be preferred to those in the received text.

We thus see that the registration of anomalous forms began during the period of the second Temple. The words of the text, especially of the Pentateuch were now finally settled, and passed over from the Sopherim or the redactors to the safe keeping of the Massorites.1 Henceforth the Massorites became the authoritative custodians of the traditionally transmitted text. Their functions were entirely different from those of their predecessors the Sopherim. The Sopherim as we have seen, were the authorised revisers and redactors of the text according to certain principles, the Massorites were precluded from developing the principles and altering the text in harmony with these canons. Their province was to safeguard the text delivered to them by "building a hedge around it",2 to protect it against alterations or the adoption of any readings which still survived in MSS, or were exhibited in the ancient Versions. For this reason they marked in the margin of every page in the Codices every unique form, every peculiarity in the orthography, every variation in ordinary phraseologies, every deviation in dittographs &c. &c.

¹ The term מְּשְׁרָה Massorah (from מְּשָׁרָה to deliver, to transmit) denotes tradition and hence technically the traditional text, the traditionally transmitted text of Holy Writ. The older form of it used in the Mishna is מַשְׁרָּה (Aboth III 20). The two forms are according to the analogy of the nouns מַשְּׁרָה Bazzarah and מַצְרָה Bazzarah, from מַצְרָה to cut off.

² Comp. מסורת סייג לתורה Aboth III 20.

In the case of the Pentateuch, the Massoretic work was comparatively easy since its text, as we have seen, was as a whole substantially the same during the period of the second Temple as it is now. Being the Divine Law which regulated both the religious and civil life of the Jewish commonwealth, the greatest care was naturally exercised by the spiritual guides and administrators of its precepts and statutes to guard and preserve it according to the ancient traditions. This, however, was not the case with the second and more especially with the third part of the Hebrew Scriptures. These were not so popularly known and the ancient Sopherim were, therefore, not so careful in the redaction of the Prophets and the Hagiographa. This is abundantly demonstrated in the books of Samuel and Kings, in the books of Kings and Chronicles &c. which contain duplicate records of identically the same events. Hence great differences obtained among the sundry Schools as to the precise reading of certain passages, and hence too Standard Codices proceeded from these Schools which more or less reflect other recensions. And although the recension which is now exhibited in the textus receptus has finally superseded the other recensions, the Massorah itself frequently records the readings of other Standard Codices. Indeed the Massorites so far from correcting any variations in the duplicate records or any manifest blunder which had crept into the text, have carefully collected them and guarded them most religiously by their wonderful system of annotation, against any attempt at reconciliation or emendation on the part of professional copyists. The present text, therefore, is not what the Massorites have compiled or redacted, but what they themselves have received from their predecessors and conscientiously guarded and transmitted with the marvellous checks and counter checks which they have devised for its safe preservation.

To accomplish this gigantic work in the absence of any Grammar, Lexicon or Concordance, the Massorites commenced their labours by minutely analysing the peculiarities of each book which they divided into Sections for the purpose of registering every expression or phrase in the margin of the respective Codices. These brief and separate remarks in the central margins which are called Massorah Parva were afterwards collected and in accordance with their similarity of import, arranged into distinct Lists or Rubrics. The larger Rubrics occupy the upper and lower margins of the same page and are called the Massorah Magna. As some of these large Lists are too lengthy, for the margin of the page on which one of the registered peculiarities occurs, the Massorites have both prefixed and appended a considerable number of them to different MSS. They cannot, therefore, be called Massorah Finalis as they are partly placed at the beginning and partly at the end of the MSS, and partly also at the end of each of the three great divisions.

To give the student an idea of this stupendous task and the years which it must have taken to carry it out, I give at the end of the chapter a specimen of the Massorah from the two oldest MSS. which have as yet come to light, viz. Orient. 4445 British Museum and the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 916. The British Museum Codex which is not later than the middle of the eighth century contains the greater portion of the Pentateuch in its original form extending from Gen. XXXIX 20 to Deut. I 33. The Massorah, however, though by a subsequent annotator, is about a century later, i. e. about the middle of the ninth century. The St. Petersburg Codex contains the Latter Prophets, viz. Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and the Twelve Minor Prophets. Its age is not disputed since it is dated A. D. 916. These two Codices, therefore, contain about half of the

entire Hebrew Bible with the Massorah both Parva and Magna.

With the specimen of the Massorah Parva and Magna, which I subjoin from Orient. 4445, folio 94b containing Levit. XI 4-21, I exhibit in parallel columns the Massorah on the same verses from nine MSS., as well as from the editio princeps so that the student may see how this safeguard has been treated by the different Massorites. In the last or the twelfth column I give the references to my Massorah where the respective Rubrics are given in full with the chapters and verses appended to them. The Massorah Parva as exhibited in the Tables is in each column an exact reproduction of the MSS. Of the Massorah Magna, however, which is in each instance followed by the catchwords of the passages in the MSS. I could naturally only reproduce the headings of the respective Rubrics. The passages adduced in each of the Lists the student will easily find in my Massorah according to the plan which I have adopted in the Tables.

It will be seen that the subjoined four Tables exhibit both the Massorahs Magna and Parva of fourteen MSS. These MSS. belong to various Schools and different countries; they range from *circa* A. D. 850 to 1488, the very year in which the first edition of the entire Hebrew Bible was printed in Soncino. The first column in the four Tables, moreover, discloses the fact that as early as the ninth century of the present era both the Massorah Parva and Magna were already fully developed. The St. Petersburg Codex alone contains no fewer than 574 different Rubrics of the Massorah Magna. As this MS. covers the smaller quarter of the entire Hebrew Bible it may safely be

¹ Alphabetically arranged they are as follows: $x_{79} + 327 + 38 + 33 + 33 + 325 + 17 + 322 + 36 + 71 + 327 + 527 + 347 + 333 + 34 + 36 + 311 + 714 + 722 + 34 + 10 = 574.$

calculated that if we had the whole Bible of this School it would exhibit according to this proportion upwards of 2000 Rubrics.

In estimating the value of this stupendous work as a safeguard for the preservation of the text which passed over to the keeping of the Massorites it is essential to bear in mind that even after the text was fixed it was by no means absolutely uniform. The different Schools still continued to retain some of their former readings. These they more or less exhibited in their Standard Codices. Some of the Massorites themselves belonged to one or the other of these Schools and framed their Massoretic notes and Rubrics in accordance with the recensions which obtained in their Schools. Hence it happens that Massoretic remarks and Lists not unfrequently contradict one another simply because each faithfully records the readings of the text from which the Massorites in question made the Rubrics. Hence too the Massorites not only record the variants in Codices which were redacted by authoritative Scribes, but adduce readings from renowned MSS. which obtained in certain communities and which are distinguished by certain names. From these sources they not unfrequently supplement the Lists made by their colleagues after certain recensions with other examples calling them either another Massorah or outside this Massorah.1

The Massorah itself has preserved lengthy Lists of various readings from the Eastern recensions which are several hundred in number and extend over the whole Hebrew Scriptures. They not only affect the orthography but the division, insertion and omission of certain words.² These variations also extend to the redivision of verses

לבד ממסורתא or אחריתא לבד.

² Vide supra, cap. IX, p. 197 &c.

which necessarily include a difference in the vowel-points and in the accents, and though I have succeeded in considerably increasing the number in the official Lists, as may be seen from the notes in my edition of the Bible, many of these recensional variations are still dispersed throughout the MSS. and await further investigation.

A striking illustration of conflicting Massorahs due to the fact that the Massorites who compiled the respective Lists worked upon different recensions, may be seen in the Rubric which registers the number of times the exceptional phrase בימים ההמה in those days occurs in contradistinction to the normal form בימים הַהַם without the paragogic He. According to our Massorah the heading of the Rubric in question distinctly declares that the abnormal phrase with the paragogic He (הַהֶּמֶה) occurs eight times which it duly specifies,2 whilst in the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 916 where this Massorah occurs three times 3 the heading in each instance as distinctly declares that there are nine such passages and duly enumerates them in all the three Rubrics. The note on Jerem. L 20 in my edition of the Massoretic text explains this contradiction, inasmuch as it is shown that the Easterns read here הַהַמָּה with the paragogic He. The Massorites, therefore, who give eight instances worked on Western recensions which we follow, whilst the Massorites who register nine passages laboured on the Eastern recensions.

The variations in the Massorah, however, are not confined to the recensions of the Western and Eastern Schools. The Massorahs which proceed from the Westerns and from which our *textus receptus* was compiled also

¹ Vide supra, cap. VI, p. 70.

Viz. Jerem. III 16, 18; V 18; L4; Joel III 2; IV 1; Zech. VIII 23;
 Neh. XIII 15. Comp. The Massorah, letter ', § 254, Vol. I, p. 716.

³ Comp. Joem. III 16; L 4; Joel III 2.

exhibit conflicting registers which undoubtedly show that there were different Schools among the Westerns themselves and that these derived their respective materials from Standard Codices. These conflicting Massorahs not only exhibit orthographical variations, but actual various readings. A few illustrations must suffice to establish this fact which has hitherto been ignored by those who appeal to the Massorah on the supposition that it always exhibits uniform remarks. The Massorahs which I subjoin are from the splendid MS. in the Paris National Library No. 1—3. It is dated A. D. 1286 and is evidently a Standard Codex:

2 Sam.	11	21	ל מל וא חם	שְׁמֹאולֶךְּ
n	XVIII	20		אַל־תבשר
'n	XXII	35	ל וחם וחד מל	נְחָשָׁה
"	•	48	ד מל	חַנּוֹתֵן
77	XXIV	22	ה מל	לָעוֹלָה
1 King	s II	32		בְרֹאשׁוֹ
n	VI	32	ד יל מל	וּפְּטָרֵי
2 Kings	s 1V	6	ל מל וב חם	בְּמְלֹאות
,	,	28	יו מל בס	הָלוֹא
"	X	15	ל דם וכל קר אֶל־המרכבה	עַל־המרכבה
"	XXII	20	דד ה צל־תמקום	אֶל־המקום
Ps.	xv	1		ומִי־ישכן
n	XVII	5	יל חם ו	אָשְׁרַיּ
n	XVIII	34	ג ב מל	בָּמוֹתֵי
,,	xxxv	I	ָּלָ װ ַ	וְרִיבְוִ
n	,,	5	ל ומל	ភព្វាធ
77	"	14	יל ומל	יאָחותָי
, X	XXVIII	7	ל הם וחד מל	שַׁחֹתִי

It is remarkable that the Massorite cancelled the original readings in all these instances and placed the Massoretic note against the emended text. I could fill pages with conflicting Massorahs from this Codex alone, but the above instances will suffice to prove my contention that different Massorites worked upon different Standard Codices and hence produced contradictory Rubrics.

But even when the Massorites of one School specify a certain number of instances which constitute a definite List, other Massorites not unfrequently supplement the Lists with more passages of a similar nature which they found in other Codices. Thus for instance the Massorah on Levit. XI 21 in Orient. 4445 which exhibits the oldest form of the List of the passages where the textual reading or the Kethiv is \$5 not, the negative particle, and the marginal reading or the Keri is it to him, preposition with the suffix third person singular masculine, declares that there are fifteen such instances. But at the end of the enumeration of the fifteen passages we find the following remark: 1 and there are two other passages outside this Massorah, viz. Isa. XLIX 5 and 1 Chron. XI 20. This positive statement is confirmed by the Massorah Parva on Isa. XLIX 5 in the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 916. This ancient MS. has the negative particle (3) in the text or the Kethiv and against it in the margin the suffix third person singular as the Keri (לו קי). Other Massorites, however, describe these two passages as constituting a difference of opinion between the different Schools of textual critics.2 This clearly shows that the diverse treatment of this important Massorah cannot possibly proceed from the same Massoretic School.

We have already seen that during the period of the second Temple, Scribes collated their copies with the

ותריין לבד מן מסרתה וישראל לא יאסף ולא שם בשלושה קדמ׳ דברי הימים.

² ותרי פלגתה עליהון Comp. The Massorah, letter ל, § 77, Vol. II,

Codices which were deposited in the Temple Court. The Massorites too, in the redaction of the text and in the compilation of the Massoretic glosses carefully consulted the Standard MSS, which were in the possession of the different communities and which for their excellency were distinguished by special names. Hence they often quote the MSS, in support of a certain reading which they have adopted in the text and as often give an alternative reading in the Massorah with the name of the MS, in which it is to be found.

(1) The Codex Mugah. — The earliest Codex quoted by the Massorites, as far as I can trace it, is the Mugah (תונה). On Exod. XXXIX 33—43 where the particle הא occurs several times in each verse and where it is sometimes with and sometimes without the Vav conjunctive the Massorah in Orient. 4445 most minutely indicates its presence and absence and at the end of the Rubric quotes "the Codex Mugah" in support of the order thus indicated. As this Massorah exhibits the peculiar manner in which the Massorites safeguarded the text and, moreover, as it is calculated to give some idea of the plan and difficulties of a Massoretic Rubric, I subjoin it with the necessary explanation in order to supply the student with a key to similar Massorahs:

סימן דויביא את המשכן את את ואת, דארון את ואת ואת. דשלחן את את ואת, מנרה את את ואת ואת המשכן את את ואת כל פסוק. דקלעי החצר את את ואת את את את את ואת ואת ואת, וחד פסוק סימן להון ואלה יעמדו על הקללה בהר, דבגדי השרד את את ואת, כבל אשר צוה את את, ודבתריה את, ושאר פסיק ואת כוליה פסוק אלין בסיפרא מוגה.

The Sign or Register: by and they brought the tabernacle [= Exod. XXXIX 33] it is twice אמ and the third time אמן; by the ark [= verse 35] it is first אמ and in the second and third instance אמן; by the table [= verse 36] it is את in the first instance and אמן the third time; by the candlestick [= verse 37] it is את the first and second time and או the third and fourth time; by the brasen altar [= verse 39] where this particle occurs six times it alternates אמ and או throughout the verse; by the hangings of the court |= verse 40|

where it also occurs six times it is IN the first and second time, IN the third and fourth time, IN the fifth time and IN the sixth time. There is one verse which serves as a mnemonic sign thereto, viz. Deut. XXVII 13 where the names of six tribes occur with exactly the same variation in the presence and absence of the Vav conjunctive. By the cloths of service [= verse 41] where it occurs three times it is IN in the first and second instances and IN in the third instance; by according to all that He commanded |= verse 42| where it occurs twice it is IN both times, and in the following verse, where it occurs once it is IN, but in the other verses [viz. verse 34 where it occurs three times and verse 38 where it occurs four times] it is IN throughout. This is according to the Codex Mugah.

The object of this Massorah and the reason for the appeal to the Mugah Codex will be seen by a reference to the notes in my edition of the Massoretic text. Both the MSS, and the ancient Versions exhibit variations in almost every verse with regard to the use of the conjunctive in this Section and the Rubric in question is manifestly a protest against these variants which obtained in other recensions.

In the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 916 which exhibits the next oldest Massorah, the authority of the Codex Mugah is appealed to in no fewer than eight instances in support of particular readings. By referring to the notes in my edition of the text it will be seen that though with the exception of one passage (Jerem. LI 46) this MS. adduces the Codex Mugah in support of the readings in the textus receptus, there are variants in every instance which are exhibited not only in other Standard Codices, but in the early editions and in the ancient Versions. Here too, therefore, the Mugah is quoted as a protest against the various readings which obtained in other Massoretic Schools.

¹ Comp. Jerem. VI 10; LI 46; Hos. I 7; II 21; XI 9; Joei I 12; Amos V 2; Habak. I 5.

The Codex Mugah is henceforth to be found referred as an authority in almost every MS. of importance either by the full title Codex Mugah (בספר מונה) or simply in the Mugah (מנה), Mugah (מנה). In the splendid MS. in the Cambridge University Library Add. 465 it is quoted several hundred times.1 Its readings are often contrasted with the readings of rival Codices and in the third Volume of the Massorah I give a List of variations between the Codex Mugah and the celebrated Codex Hilleli which extends over the whole Bible and which I have found in the Munich Codex.2 The Mugah was copied by the heads of Schools in various communities and in different ages as is evident from the fact that it is quoted by textual critics in districts far apart. Hence the earlier copies of it are not unfrequently referred to in contradistinction to later copies.3

(2) Codex Hilleli (ספר הללי). The Codex which in importance rivals the Mugah and which is frequently quoted in the Massorah in support of certain readings is the Hilleli. According to Zakkuto this famous Codex was written by R. Hillel circa A. D. 600. In the Chronicle which he compiled about A. D. 1500 Zakkuto tells us as follows:

In the year 4957 A. M. on the 28th of Ab [= Aug. 14, 1197 A. D.] there was a great persecution of the Jews in the Kingdom of Leon from the two Kingdoms that came to besiege it. At that time they removed thence the twenty-four sacred books which were written about 600 years before. They were written by R. Hillel b. Moses b. Hillel and hence are called after his name the Hilleli Codex. It was exceedingly correct and all other Codices were revised by it. I saw the remaining two parts of it containing the Former and Latter Prophets written in large and beautiful characters

¹ Comp. The Massorah, Vol. III, p. 23-36.

² Comp. The Massorah, Vol. III, p. 130-134.

³ Comp. מונה הקרמון Isa. VIII 8; XXVIII 12 in Orient. 1478 British Museum.

which were brought by the exiles to Portugal and sold at Bugia in Africa where they still are, having been written about 900 years ago. Kimchi in his Grammar on Numb. XV 4 says that the Pentateuch of the Hilleli Codex was extant in Toledo.

And though like the Mugah this famous Codex is now lost, both the Massorites and subsequent Grammarians frequently appeal to it in support of their readings either as Codex Hilleli or simply as the the Hilleli.² In two instances I have found it referred to as the Hilleli of Leon.³ Besides the List of variations between the Mugah Codex and the Hilleli already adverted to, I have given a List from this celebrated Codex setting forth the plenes and defectives throughout the Pentateuch which I have found in the Merzbacher MS. Jacob Saphir has printed a similar List in the second Volume of his work entitled Eben Saphir.⁴

(3) Another Standard Codex which is often appealed to in the Massorah Parva is the Zambuki (זנבוקי). This name the Codex probably obtained because it belonged to the community in Zambuki on the Tigris. Its readings are frequently adduced side by side with the Hilleli Codex,

י בשנת תתתקבו (ו. מ) ביום לה לירח אב היה שמד גדול במלכות ליאון משני מלכים שבאו עליהם במבצר אחד ואז הוציאו משם הכד ספרים שהיו כתובים קודם מלכים שבאו עליהם במבצר אחד ואז הוציאו משם הכד ספרים שהיו כתובים קודם לכן כמו שש מאות שנה שכתב אותם ר' הלל בן משה בן הלל ועל שמו נקרא ההלילי שהיו מדויקות ומהם מגיהים כל הספרים ואני ראיתי השני מקראות נביאים ראשונים ואחרונים מכתיבת אותיות גדולות ומדוייקות שהביאו מגרוש פורטונאל בוגיאה באפריקה ושם הם שיש עתה מ' מאות שנה שנכתבי והקמחי בחלק הדקדוק קודם במלימלה שדבר על הדקדוק למען תוכרו אומ' כי החומש מן ההילילי היח בטולימלה Juchassin, p 220 ed. Filipowski, London 1857; and Neubauer in Studia Biblica, Vol. 111, p. 23, Oxford 1891.

בללי ספר הללי Comp. The Massorah, Vol. III, p. 23-36.

³ הללי של ליון Comp. 1 Kings I 18; Jerem. V 6; in Add. 15251, British Museum.

⁴ Comp. The Massorah, Vol. III, p. 106-129; and Eben Saphir, Vol. II, p. 192-213, Mainz 1874.

especially in the superb MS. Oriental 2626—28 in the British Museum,¹ as will be seen in the notes to my edition of the Hebrew Bible. Like the other Standard Codices it is known only through the quotations in the Massorah.

- (4) Another Standard MS. which is frequently quoted in the Massorah and which has also become a prey to time is the Jerushalmi (ירושלמי) or the Jerusalem Codex. This MS. was largely used by the celebrated Grammarian and Lexicographer R. Jonah Abu-Walid as is attested by Kimchi, who states (Michlol, p. 184b, ed. Fürth 1793) that he has constantly quoted it as his authority for certain readings and that it was for many years in Saragossa.² In the Massorah this Codex is frequently quoted as exhibiting a different orthography to that of the Codex Hilleli.³
- (ז'ריקו') which is also often referred to in the Massorah seems to have embraced only the Pentateuch, since in the references to it, it is sometimes called the *Jericho Pentateuch* (הומש יריחו). The List from this Codex which I have printed in my edition of the Massorah, I collected from the Massorah Parva in Oriental 2696 in the British Museum.
- (6) The Codex Sinai (סיני or simply ספר סיני) is another of the Standard MSS., which is referred to in the Massorah, but which has also perished. In the superb MS. Arund. Orient. 16 in the British Museum which is itself a

י Comp. Orient 2626—28 on Gen. IV, 17; IX 14; XLII 2, 21; XLIII 10, 21; XLV 10; XLVI 29; XLIX 10; L 11 and especially Exod. XLVI 29; XXXI 27; Numb. XXXIV 4, Comp. The Massorah, Vol. III, p. 23—36. דורבי יונה כתב כי מַאְנֵיי רשע רפה ולא מצאנוהו אנחנו כן אלא בספר אחד בי וונה כתב ממקר הו"ו והוא הספר אשר סמך עליו רבי יונה כי הוא מביא ראיה עמיד ממקרא ירושלמי וזהו שהיה בסרקוסטא זה שנים רבות; ספר מכלול דף קפר פיורדא שנת תקנ"נ.

³ Comp. The Massorah, Vol. III, p. 106 &c.

⁴ Comp. The Massorah, Vol. III, p. 135.

Model Codex, the Sinai Codex is appealed to in the Massorah Parva on six different occasions in confirmation of certain readings. Thus (1) on Josh. XXI 36 it is quoted to justify the omission of the two verses 36 and 37.¹ (2) On 2 Kings VI 25 it is adduced in support of the reading of the reading doves dung in two words.² (3) On 2 Kings XXIII 31 it is referred to in support of the textual reading of the proper name אַמּשׁבּׁל Hamutal without a Keri.³ (4) On 2 Kings XXV 11 the Massorah Parva states that the Codex Sinai uniformly reads the proper name בְּבִּוּבְּאָבְּוֹ Nebuzaradan as one word.¹ (5) On Jerem. XXXIX 1 it is quoted as having here no section.⁵ And (6) on Amos V 6 the Massorah Parva remarks that Beth-El is always in two words in Codex Sinai.⁶

In the printed Massorah Parva too, this Codex is quoted twice, once on Exod. XVIII ו where it is stated that the word משמי and he heard, occurs twice with the accent Gershain at the beginning of a verse in the Pentateuch and that it is in Sinai with the accent Rebia and once on Exod. XVIII 5 where it is stated that מל־המרב into the wilderness, which has the accent Sakeph in the textus receptus, is with the accent Sakeph-gadol in Codex Sinai. As both these instances occur in the Pentateuch, and moreover, as they both refer to the accents, Elias Levita concluded that the Codex Sinai contained only the Pentateuch and that it treated simply on the variations

י אין כ' פסוק' הללו כתוב' בספר סיני ובספר רבי' גרשם.

⁻² כן כת' בספר סיני תרי אתין

³ אך בסיני כתב חמושל.

⁴ כתב סיני תיבה אחת כוליה.

בסיני אין כאן פסקא לא פתוחה ולא סתומה.

⁶ בַּית־אֵל לְבֵית־אֵל כולם ב׳ תיבות בסיני.

יני רביע. שני גרישין ר״פ בתור׳ סיני רביע. ⁷

י המדבר סיני המדבר בזקף גדול.

of the accents. The passages, however, which I have adduced from the books of Joshua, Kings, Jeremiah and Hosea show beyond doubt that this Codex contained the whole Hebrew Scriptures.

Jacob b. Isaac of Zousmir, who wrote a little expository Treatise on the Massorah which was first published at Amsterdam in 1649, and a second edition of which appeared at the same place in 1702, maintains that Sinai is the name of one of the redactors who revised the Pentateuch with the same accuracy as if it proceeded from Mount Sinai.² Joseph Eshwe, who compiled a Commentary on the Massorah, not only espoused this view, but vouch-safed more definite information on this subject. His statement on Exod. XVIII is as follows:

As to the remark Sinai has Rebia, know that the inventors of the vowel-points and the accents were mostly from the spiritual heads and the sages of Tiberias. Now the name of one of these was Sinai, and he differed from the Massorah, which remarks that משמל and he heard, in the two passages in question has Gershaim, and said that it has the accent Rebia.

The authors of these fanciful explanations, however, did not know that in the MSS. the full name מפר ספר מיני is given which can denote only the Codex Sinai, just as ספר ירושלמי denotes the Jerusalem Codex, and ירושלמי the Jericho Codex.

(ק) The Great Machsor (מחזורא רבא) is the name of another Standard Codex which is frequently quoted in the

ים יני שם חומש מדוייק מדבר ממחלוקת המעמים, כגון וְיַּשְׁמֵּע יתרו בגרשים, בייני שם חומש מדוייק מדבר ממחלוקת המעמים, כגון וּיִשְׁמֵּע יתרו בגרשיע, ועור שם אל משה אל־הַמְּדְבָּר בוֹקף ובסיני בוֹקף גדול ולא ידעתי ועור שם אל משה אל־הַמְּדְבָּר בוֹקף במחבר: Comp. Massoreth Ha-Massoreth, p. 259, ed. Ginsburg, London 1867.

ים מיני אחד מן המחברים והגיה ספר תורה כאלו היא נתנה מסיני: פירוש על במסורה דף ג' עמוד ב'.

³ ומה שאמר סיני רביע דע כי בעלי מתקני הניקוד והטעמים רבים היו מגאוני חכמי טבריא, ואחר מהם היה שמו סיני והוא פליג על המסורת דאמר שני מלות וישמע הנו׳ המה בטעם גרשיים, ואמר הוא שהם בטעם רביע: מבין חדות, שמות י״ח א׳.

Massorah. 1 Machsortha or Machsor is the common name of the Jewish Ritual which comprises the whole annual cycle of the Daily and Festival Services. The Cycle, which is the literal meaning of Machsortha (from הוֹר to go round), was generally written by the most distinguished scholars of the respective Communities in the various parts of the world embodying the local usages and hence obtained the name of the special place where it was written and of the practice which it sets forth. Thus the celebrated Machsor Vitry, which was compiled by R. Simcha circa 1100 A. D., describes the Ritual of the Synagogue of Vitry in France. It is from this Machsor which is in the British Museum (Add. 27200-27201) that I published the Taagim or the Crowned Letters in the Pentateuch.² These Rituals or Machsorim not only contained the Prayers and Hymns, but frequently gave the text of the whole Bible so that they became the models after which copies were made. It is owing to this fact that the Bible Codex by itself was called Machsor inasmuch as it contained the Annual or Triennial Cycle of lessons which were read on the week days, Sabbaths, feasts and fasts.3 The "Great Machsor" was manifestly the name of a special Codex to distinguish it from any other Biblical MS., which was simply called Machsor.

From the readings of the Great Machsor, which are adduced in the Massorah Parva, it would appear that this celebrated Codex exhibited the recension of Ben Naphtali. Thus for instance the Massorah Parva in Add. 15251, British Museum, quotes נשנעתי I sware, with Kametz Deut.

¹ Comp. Harley 5720 on 2 Kings XIX 25; Add. 15251 on Deut. XXXI 21; 1 Sam. XXII 17; 2 Kings XIX 25; 2 Chron. XXXII 30 &c.

² Comp. The Massorah, Vol. II, p. 680-701.

³ Vide supra, Part II, pp. 241, 244 &c.

XXXI 21 as the textual reading in the Great Machsor¹ which is also the reading of Ben Naphtali. The same is the case in 1 Sam. XXII 17 which we are told the Great Machsor reads לפּבֿע to strike, with the Gimel Raphe and which is also the reading of Ben Naphtali. Indeed this appears to be the case in the other three instances contained in the Rubric of the Massorah given in my MS.2

- (8) The Codex Ezra (ספר עזרא) is another Standard MS. which is quoted in the Massorah Parva. The only MS. which I have as yet seen, professing to be a copy of the Ezra Codex, is in my possession. A more detailed description of it will be found in chap. XII of this Introduction. In the Massorah Parva of this MS. the Codex Ezra is referred to twice, once on Numb. XXI 14 in support of the reading אַת־וָהֶב in two words3 and once on Deut. XXXII 6 in confirmation of the division הל יהוה.
- (ס) The Babylonian Codex (ספר בבלי). The twelve quotations from this Codex which I have been able to collect are of the utmost importance inasmuch as the Babylon Codex exhibits the Eastern recension. With the exception of 1 Kings XX 33 they have not hitherto been known as Eastern readings. Their importance is still more enhanced by the fact that nine of the readings in question are to be found in the Latter Prophets and thus enable us to test the assertion that the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 916, which contains this portion of the Hebrew Scriptures, has the text of the Eastern recension. The eleven instances are as follows:

ינשבַעת: לַ במחזורא רבא:

² In my MS. the Massorah Parva on Deut. XXVI 12 has the following במהזורא רבא קורין לַעשַּׁר לְסָבֹב לַהְשׁוֹת לְפָנֹע ובטבריא קורין לַעְשֵׂר לְסָבֹב כלהו ברגש Comp. The Massorah Vol. III, p. 25. אתרוַהֶב שתי תיבות כתוב בספר עזרא.

[•] תר תבות נמצא בספר עזרא הל תיבה אח והשם אחרת.

(1) Numb. XXVI 33. — In Codex No. 1—3 in the Paris National Library, which is dated A. D. 1286, the Massorah Parva tells us that the Westerns read here and Tirzah with Vav conjunctive and that the Babylon Codex = the Easterns, reads it Tirzah without the Vav. As the Massoretic remark which indicates this variation in the two recensions will give the student some idea of the cryptography of the Massorah and the difficulty in deciphering it, I subjoin it with the necessary explanation

That is, according to the Westerns = Palestinians the mnemonic sign here for the order of the five daughters of Zelophehad is

מ (= מחלה), ו (= ונעה), ח (= חנלה), מ (= מלכה), ו (= וחרצה) and Tirzah Milcah Hoglah and Noah Mahalah

According to the Babylon Codex it is

מ (= מחלה), ו (= ונעה), ח (= חגלה), מ (= מלכה), ת (= תרצה)
Tirzah Milcah Hoglah and Noah Mahalah

(2) I Kings XX 33. — The Authorised Version of this verse is simply a loose paraphrase and does not indicate that there is an official various reading here. The real difficulty in the text may he seen in the Revised Version when the rendering in the text is compared with the alternative given in the margin. According to the Babylon Codex which is the Eastern recension, the words are divided ויחלמוה ממנו and the passage is accordingly to be rendered

Now the men divined and hasted [i. e. quickly divined] and they pressed whether it was from him and they said &c.

According to the Western recension, however, or the textus receptus it is only in the textual reading or the Kethiv that the words in question are divided ויחלטו המטו and the Keri or the official reading divides them ויחלטוה מטו. Accordingly the passage is to be translated

Now the men divined and hasted [i. e. quickly divined] and they pressed it out from him, and they said &c.

The Chaldee Syriac and Rashi follow the word division of the *Keri*. The fact that the *textus receptus* exhibits here the Babylonian or Eastern recension we learn from the Massorah Parva in Orient. 1478, fol. 44b, British Museum.

the Massorah Parva in Orient. 1478, fol. 44b, British Museum. (3) Isa. XXVII 8. — The Massorah Parva on this passage in Orient. 2201 British Museum, which is dated

A. D. 1246, distinctly states that the Babylonian Codex reads here ברוח הקשה with a rough spirit, without the suffix third person masculine. The St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 916, however, like our textus receptus or the Western recension reads בְּרוֹחוֹ הֹקְשׁה with his rough spirit.

(4) Isa. LVII 6. — The Massorah Parva in the same

MS. remarks on הָּשֶׁלֵית thou hast offered, that the Babylon Codex points it אָעֶלִית with Tzere,³ whereas the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 916 has it as our text.

(5) Jerem. XXIII 18. — In the textus receptus, the

(6) Jerem. XLIV 25. — In the same MS. the Massorah Parva states on מַלְאַחָם ye have fulfilled or filled, the Piel

Parva states on מָלֵאתָם ye have fulfilled or filled, the Pie

י וַיַּחְלְטוּ הַמְמֵנוּ כן בספ׳ בבלא׳, ונסח׳ מערב׳ ויחלטו הממנו כתי׳ ויחלטוה

ממנו ק'. Comp. also Harley 5710—11 on 1 Kings XX 33. בכבלי ברוח Comp. fol. 196 a.

³ בכבלי הֶעֲלֵית Comp. fol. 205*b*. 1 בכבלי בברלי בברלי בברלי בברלי בברלי בברלי בברלי

preterite that the Babylon Codex reads it מלאתם in the Kal, whereas the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 916 reads it in the Piel as it is in the Western text or in the textus receptus.

- (7) Ezek. VIII 3. In Additional 21161 British Museum the Massorah Parva remarks that all the Codices read here ירושלמה to Jerusalem, with local He (ה) excepting the Babylonian Codex which has ירושלם without the local He in the text = Kethiv, and ירושלמה with the local He as the official reading = Keri, in the margin.² The St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 916, however, like the textus receptus or the Western recension has ירושלמה in the text without any Keri.
- (8) Ezek. VIII 3 The Massorah Parva on the same verse, in the same MS. states that boo likeness, or image, is pointed 500 with Segol under the Samech in the Babylon Codex.3 This certainly implies that the Babylonians used the infralinear punctuation side by side with the superlinear one, since the latter system has no Segol $[= \pi]$. The inference would not be so conclusive but for the fact that in all other instances where the variations from the Babylonian recension are given they differ from the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 916 which is supposed to exhibit the Babylonian text.
- (9) Ezek. XXIII 17. In Orient. 2201 the Massorah Parva remarks on ותקע נפשה מהם and her soul was alienated from them, that the Babylonian Codex reads here בהם instead of מהם, whereas the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 916 like the textus receptus or the Western recension reads Data.

ו בבבל מְלַאֹּחָם Orient, 2201, fol. 222b.

² בכל הספרים ירושלמה כת, בכבלי ירושלם בת ירושלמה ק Comp. Add. 21161, fol. 97a

של פלגו בכבלי ממל פלגו 3 Comp. Add. 21161, fol. 97a.

ל בהם ל Comp. Orient. 2201, fol. 236b.

(10) Ezek. XXIII 18. — The Massorah Parva in the same MS. remarks on ותקע נפשי מעליה then my mind was alienated from her, that the Babylon Codex reads then her mind was alienated from her, נפשי instead of נפשי as in the preceding verse, whereas the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 916 reads here as the textus receptus.

(11) Ezek. XXXVI 23. — Instead of "when I shall be sanctified in you before their eyes", Orient. 2201 reads "when I shall be sanctified in them before your eyes", with the Massoretic remark that the Babylonian Codex reads "in you before their eyes" which is the reading exhibited in our text. This is the first instance in which the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 916 has the reading which is ascribed to the Babylonians in Orient. 2201. It is to be remarked that in the passage before us we do not follow the Western reading which is exhibited in the text of Orient. 2201 but contrary to the usual practice we have adopted the Eastern recension.

It will thus be seen that in ten instances out of the eleven the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 916 deviates from the readings which the Massorah in the MSS. positively describes as Babylonian or Eastern. They must, therefore, be added to those which we have already adduced in support of our contention that the designation of Codex Babylonicus which is given to this MS. is incorrect since the Codex in question does not exhibit the Babylonian recension.3

Besides the Babylonian recension the Massorah Parva also refers to other Eastern Standard MSS. which were in the possession of different communities. Add. 15251 in

¹ בבבלי נפשה Comp. Orient, 2201, fol. 236b.

² בהם לעיניכם, בכבלי בכם לעיניהם Comp. Orient. 2201, fol. 242 a.

³ Vide supra, Part II, chap. IX, p. 215-231.

the British Museum appeals to the Codex of Bagdad and the Codex Sharki. Thus for instance —

- (ו) 2 Kings XVIII 9 where the name Shalmaneser occurs which is pointed in the textus receptus שֵׁלְמֵנֶאֶּטֶר = Shalman-eser, the Massorah Parva remarks that in the Bagdad Codex the orthography of this name is שֵׁלְמֵנֶאֶּטֶר = Shalma-neser.¹ This spelling would naturally also apply 2 Kings XVII 3 the only other passage where this name occurs.
- (2) In 2 Kings XIX 37 the Massorah Parva in the same MS. remarks on the name אַדְרָשָּלְּךְ Adrammelech, that in the Bagdad Codex it is אַדְרָשָּלְּךְ Adarmelech. As this name also occurs in 2 Kings XVII 31 and Isa. XXXVII 38 this orthography must have obtained in all the three passages.
- (3) On עָנְבִים grapes, Isa. V z the Massorah Parva states that the Sharki Codex reads it with a Nun instead of $Beth.^3$
- (4) Isa. LI 10. In the textus receptus the reading here is הַשְּׁמָה that hath made, Kal preterite third person singular feminine from שוֹם to put, to make, with the prefix He (ה). For this the Sharki Codex according to the Massorah Parva in the same MS. reads הַשְּׁמָה with Dagesh in the Mem (2).4
- (5) Ezek. IV 16. On ובּדְאָנָה and with care, the Massorah Parva in the same MS. tells us that the Sharki Codex reads it ובראנה with the accent under the Aleph.⁵

It will thus be seen that this Model Codex according to the testimony of the Massorah itself exhibited deviations

יַשְׁלְמֵנֶאְּסֶר פּי אל בנרארי 1 Comp. Add. 15251, fol. 211 a.

² נ"א וְאַרַרְמֶּלֶךְ פּי אלכנדרי Comp. Add. 15251, fol. 212b.

³ פי אל שרקי ענוים Comp. Add. 15251, fol. 217b.

⁴ בשמה בי אל שרקי רגש המם Comp. Add. 15251, fol. 234a.

ה יבראנה פי אל שרקי ובראנה ה Comp. Add. 15251, fol. 270a.

from the received text both in the vowel-signs and the accents. The variations in the sundry Standard MSS are thus adduced in the Massorah as alternative readings without any expression of an adverse opinion against them, though the preference in all these cases is presumeably given to the textual readings. The Massorites, however, who compiled the Rubrics from the sundry Standard Codices necessarily produced Lists which though in harmony with their respective exemplars could not fail to differ from each other.

A striking illustration of this fact is to be found in the Model Codex Harley 5710—11 in the British Museum. In the account of the lives of the patriarchs two phrases are used which, though translated alike, are different in the Hebrew, inasmuch as one is ויהי כל ימי and all the days were (was in the Hebrew), where the verb is in the singular, and the other is ויהיו כל ימי, where the verb is in the plural. The Massorah Parva in the MS. in question remarks on Gen. V 23 that the phrase where it is in the singular occurs three times and gives the mnemonic sign for the three passages Enoch, Lamech and Noah, viz. Gen. V 23, 31; IX 1. In the same MS. and on the very same passage the Massorah Magna states that the phrase in the singular only occurs twice, viz. in connection with Enoch and Lamech (Gen. V 23, 31) and that all the Massorites who give the mnemonic sign for the three passages are positively wrong, since in the case of Noah (Gen. IX 1) the verb is in the plural in the correct MSS. till Elias the prophet comes who will clear up all doubts.2 Now on turning to Gen. IX I which is the passage in dispute

יהי כלימי חלן סימן ווהי כלימי חלן סימן Comp. Harley 5710—11, fol. 4a. 2 ויהי כל ימי ב חל סימן, חנוך למך ומשעי׳ כל הנקדני׳ ומוסרין חלן סימן וטעות הוא בידם כי חל סימן ועל נה הוא בספרים מרויקי' ויהיו כל ימי ער שיבא אליהו.

this very MS. not only has וְיָהִינּ the plural in the text, but has the following Massorah on it:

Here all the Punctuators err for they Massoretically remark the mnemonic sign is בו Enoch, Lamech, Noah [i. e. in Gen. V 23, 31; IX 31 it is יוֹן in the singular] and this is a mistake on their part for their eyes were closed from looking into the Jericho Pentateuch, and into the Sephardic MSS. where the mnemonic sign is בול Enoch, Lamech, viz. Gen. V 23, 31.

Accordingly there are only these two instances where the verb in the phrase in question is in the singular. We have thus two conflicting Massorahs in the same MS. One Rubric proceeds from the School whose recension had ויהי כל ימי in the singular in three passages and ויהי כל ימי the plural in seven passages² and the other emanates from the School the Codices of which had the singular in only two instances and the plural in eight passages.

A most important part of this stupendous Corpus is the graphic system of accents and vowel-signs which the Massorites invented and with which they have furnished every expression of the Hebrew Scriptures. With the vowel-signs they most minutely fixed the pronunciation and meaning of each separate word in accordance with the tradition handed down to them from time immemorial, whilst with the accents they indicated the logical and syntactical relation of the words to one another and to the whole clause and verse.

But just as in the case of the consonants, the different Schools redacted the text in accordance with the traditions which obtained amongst them so also was it with the punctuation and accentuation. The Eastern School with its subordinate colleges and the Western School with its

יוהיו כל ימי נח כאן משע" כל הנקדנים ומוחרין חולן סימו וטעות היא בידם כי שחו עיניהם מראות בחומש יריחו ובספרדים כי חול סימן.

² Comp. The Massorah, letter 7, § 204, Vol. I, p. 310.

diverse academies elaborated their respective systems independently of each other, in harmony with the views transmitted to them by their authoritative spiritual guides. Hence the difference in the vowel-points and accents which are exhibited in some of the most ancient and best Codices. Hence too the variations between the ancient Versions and the present Massoretic text in numerous instances which exhibit identically the same consonants but which are entirely due to a difference in the pronunciation and construction of the consonants, thus indicating a difference in the traditions with regard to the vowels and meaning of the words in question.

That the graphic signs are not coeval with the consonants is now generally admitted, though the precise date of their introduction cannot be ascertained. It is certain that they did not exist in the fifth century. This is attested by St. Jerome both in his commentaries on the Hebrew Scriptures and in his numerous other writings. From the sundry remarks of this celebrated Father it is evident that the Hebrew text which he used had no graphic signs for the vowel-points. Fully to appreciate the force of the evidence derived from his writings it is necessary to realise the circumstances under which he wrote.

St. Jerome was frequently obliged to describe most minutely the condition of the Hebrew text in a very elementary manner in order to convey to his Latin contemporaries an idea of the peculiarities of the Semitic original. As his translation differed from the Versions of the Septuagint, Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion and the Quinta, and also from the Vetus Itala, with which his readers were familiar; and moreover, as these Versions frequently differed among themselves, St. Jerome was compelled on almost every page not only to justify his

own peculiar renderings, but to explain the cause of the variations in the Versions as well as to expose their errors.

To effect this he discusses the orthographical and linguistical peculiarities of the Hebrew text, and in his explanations he frequently analyses the words. He states how many consonants there are in the word, and names each letter by its Hebrew name. He describes how the same consonants are differently pronounced according to the arbitrariness of the Hebrew reader, or according to the dialect of the Province to which he belongs; how it is that the same word has different meanings and how the same consonants express two or three different ideas. And yet he never mentions the names of our vowel-signs in the numerous exegetical writings nor does he give us the slightest hint that any graphical or diacritical marks were used in the Hebrew Scriptures to indicate the difference in the pronunciation of the same consonants when they are intended to convey a different sense upon which he dwells so much, and which he is so anxious to explain to his readers. A few illustrations from his expositions will demonstrate this fact.

(1) Commenting on Melchizedek he says:

It matters little whether we pronounce it Salem or Salim because the Hebrew words have very seldom a vowel [-letter = mater lectionis] in the middle [== stem, or root] and they are pronounced differently according to the requirements of the context and according to the various pronunciations of the provinces.¹

¹ Nec refert, utrum Salem an Salim nominetur, cum vocalibus in medio litteris perraro utantur Hebraei, et pro volutate lectorum, ac varietate regionum, eadem verba diversis sonis atque accentibus proferantur. Comp. Epist. 126 ad Evagr. Vol. II, Col. 574, ed. Martinian, Paris 1699. By vocalibus in medio litteris is meant the matres lectionis in in the middle of a word in contradistinction to the suffixes at the end. Hupfeld has conclusively shown that accentus means pronunciation. Comp. Theologische Studien und Kritiken 1830, p. 582-586.

It will be seen that if the graphic signs for the \bar{e} and 7 had existed in his days this learned Father would assuredly have said when the word in question has *Tzere* under the *Lamed* (?) it is pronounced *Salem* and when it has *Chirck* (?) it is pronounced *Salim*. Even the diacritical sign which now marks the distinction between Sin (\mathbf{v}) and Shin (\mathbf{v}) had not as yet been introduced for he pronounced it *Salem* instead of *Shalem*.

(2) Gen. XXXVI 24. — On the words "this was the Anah that found jamim in the wilderness" he remarks:

Others assign to it the meaning of sea because it is written with the same letters which signify both.

With the vowel points affixed to the expression in question it cannot possibly denote both.

Isa II 22. — The last clause of this verse St. Jerome renders because he was highly thought of, and remarks:

The Septuagint omits this clause and Origen added it with an asterisk from the edition of Aquila Where we have it he was highly thought of. Aquila renders it wherein that man was thought of. The Hebrew word is **Bama** and may either denote $v\psi\omega\mu\alpha=high$, as we read it in Kings and Ezekiel, or certainly wherein. Both are written with same letters **Beth**, **Mem**, **He**, and the sense is according to the context. If we wish to read it wherein we pronounce it **Bamma**, and if high or highly we pronounce it **Bamma**.

- ¹ Allii putant ajamim maria appellata. Iisdem enim litteris scribuntur maria, quibus et nunc hic sermo descriptus est. Et volunt illum dum pascit asinos patris sui in deserto, aquarum congregationes reperisse: quae juxta idioma linguae Hebraice maria nuncupentur: quod scilicet stagmum repererit, cujus rei inventio in eremo difficilis est. Nonnulli putant aquas calidas juxta Punicae linguae viciniam, quae Hebraeae contermina est, hoc vocabulo signari. Question. Heb. in Genesim Vol. II. Col. 539.
- ² Quia excelsus reputatus est ipse. Hoc praetermisere LXX et in Graecis exemplaribus ab Origene sub asteriscis de editione Aquilae additum est; quod in Hebraeo ita legitur: Hedalu Lachem men Aadam Aser Nasama Baaphpho chi Bama nesab hu. Ubi nos dixemus: excelsus reputatus est ipse: Aquila interpretatus est, in quo reputatus est iste. Verbum Hebraicum Bama, vel ΰψωμα dicitur, id est; excelsum; quod et in Regnorum libris et in

Leaving out the exegesis of the passage which this learned Father advances, the statement conclusively shows that the text upon which he commented could not possibly have had the vowel-points, for the graphic signs preclude this double pronunciation.

(4) Jerem. III 1. — "But thou hast played the harlot with many lovers" or says St. Jerome "with many shepherds," because he adds:

The Hebrew word *Reim* which is spelled with the four letters *Res*, *Ain, Jod, Mem*, denotes both lovers and shepherds. If we pronounce it *Reim*, it means lovers, and if *Roim* it signifies shepherds.

If the Hebrew text before him had the graphic vowelpoints he could not have propounded this double pronunciation.

(5) Jerem. IX 21. — On the passage "Speak, Thus saith the Lord" St. Jerome remarks as follows:

The Hebrew word which is written with three letters Daleth, Beth, Resh, has no vowel-signs in the middle. It is only the context and the arbitrary opinion of the reader which determines the pronunciation. If it is pronounced dabar it denotes a word, if deber it is death, if daber it is speak. Hence both the Septuagint and Theodotion join it with what precedes and render it "they drove the children out of doors, the young men from the streets of death," whilst Aquila and Symmachus translate it speak.²

Ezechiele legimus; vel certe in quo; et eisdem litteris scribitur Beth, Mem, He; ac pro locorum qualitate, si voluerimus legere, in quo, dicimus Bamma; sin autem, excelsum vel excelsus, legimus Bama. Vol. III. Col. 30.

- ¹ Et tu fornicata es cum amatoribus multis (sive pastoribus). Verbum enim Reim quod quattuor litteris scribitur Res, Ain, Jod, Mem, et amatores. et pastores utrumque significat. Et si legamus Reim amatores significat; si Roim pastores. Comp. Vol. III, Col. 541.
- ² Loquere, haec dicit Dominus: ... Verbum Hebraicumquod tribus litteris scribitur Daleth, Beth, Res (vocales enim in medio non habet) pro consequentia et legentis arbitrio si legatur Dabar, sermonem significat; si deber, mortem; si daber, loquere. Unde et LXX et Theodotio junxerunt illud praeterito capitulo, ut dicerent: Disperdent parvulos de foris; juvenes de plateis morte. Aquila verò et Symmachus transtulerunt λάλησον, id est, loquere. Comp. Vol. III, Col. 576.

Accordingly this diversity of rendering, St. Jerome tells us is due to the fact that the three unpointed consonants דבר may be pronounced דְּבֶר word, קבָר pestilence, or קבר speak. With the vowel-points already affixed to the word in question no such diversity of pronunciation and interpretation could possibly have obtained.

(6) Hosea XIII 3. — On the words "and as the smoke out of the chimney" St. Jerome remarks as follows:

It may be asked why the Septuagint has locust for chimney which Theodotion renders καπνοδόχου? The Hebrews spell locust and chimney with the same four letters Aleph. Res, Beth, He. If it is pronounced arbe it denotes locust and if orobba it means chimney, which Aquila renders καταράκτου and Symmachus foramen an opening made in the wall for the escape of the smoke.

No such diversity of pronunciation and interpretation is possible with the vowel-signs affixed to the four consonants.

The evidence from the Talmudic and Midrashic writings is to the same effect. No mention is made either in the Talmud or the Midrashim of the names of the graphic-signs, though in one notable instance they would most assuredly have been referred to if they had existed in those days. R. Abba b. Cahana and R. Acha who flourished in the fourth century of the present era in their allegorical interpretation of Song, of Songs I II tell us as follows:

With studs of silver. — R. Abba b. Cahana says this denotes the letters. R. Acha says it means the words. Others say "we will make thee borders of gold" denotes the writing, "with studs of silver" means the ruled lines.²

[!] Quaerimus autem quare LXX pro fumario quod Theodotio transtulit καπνοδόχον locustas interpretati sunt? Apud Hebraeos, locusta et fumarium, iisdem scribitur litteris Aleph, Res, Beth, He. Quod si legatur arbe, locusta dicitur; orobba, fumarium; pro quo Aquila καταφάκτον, Symmachus foramen interpretati sunt. Comp. Vol. III, Col. 1325.

עם נקודת הכסף. רבי אבא בר כהנא אמר אלו האותיות. רבי אחא אמר אלו ² ניס נקודת הכסף. ד"א תורי זהב נעשה לך. זה הכתב. עם נקורת הכסף. זה הסרגל: Midrash Rabba on the Song of Songs I II, fol. IIb, ed. Wilna 1878.

It will be seen that though these sages in their allegorical exposition propound the verse in question to describe the letters, the words, the writing and the ruled lines of Holy Writ, they make no mention whatever of the vowel-signs. This remarkable omission is all the more striking when it is borne in mind that term points, upon which they comment, is the very name for the graphic signs.

The anecdote in the Talmud, referred to by Elias Levita, is another proof of the fact that the graphic signs did not exist in the Talmudic period. R. Dine, of Nehardea, maintained that he only should be appointed teacher of youths who had a good pronunciation, even if he was not very learned since it is very difficult to unlearn an acquired mistake. To enforce this principle the sage refers to the story which describes Joab's slaying the whole male population in Edom recorded in I Kings XI 15, 16 and in connection with which we are told as follows:

When Joab returned to David the latter asked him: What is the reason that thou hast thus acted? [i. e. slain the males only]. To this Joab replied: Because it is written, Thou shalt blot out the males of Amalek [Deut. XXV 19]. He [David] then said to him: We read Secher = the memory, to which he [Joab] replied, I have been taught to read it Sachar = males, and went to enquire of his Rabbi, asking him: How didst thou teach me to read it? To which he replied Secher = memory. Whereupon he [Joab] seized his sword to slay him. He [the Rabbi] asked why? To which he replied: Because it is written, 'Cursed be he that doeth the work of the Lord deceitfully' [Jerem. XLVIII 10]. Upon which he [the Rabbi] said: Away with him who lays hold of a curse. He [Joab] said again: It is written, 'And cursed be he who keepeth back his sword from blood' [Jerem. XLVIII 10]. Some say that he did slay him and some say that he did not slay him. (Comp. Bable Bathra 21 a—b).

י בי אתא לקמיה דדוד אמר ליה מאי שעמא עבדת הכי אמר ליה רכתיב תמחה את זכר עמלק אמר ליה והא אנן זכר קרינן א"ל אנא זכר אקריון אזל שייליה לרביה אמר ליה היאך אקריתן אמר ליה זכר שקל ספסירא למיקטליה אמר ליה אמאי א"ל דכתיב ארור עושה מלאכת ה' רמיה א"ל שבקיה לההוא גברא דליקום בארור א"ל

This anecdote conclusively shows that the consonants (ICI) were then without the graphic signs, for with the vowel-points attached to the letters the different readings n question could not have obtained.

The evidence for the non-existence of the vowelpoints extends to the sixth or even to the beginning of the seventh century. The Treatise Sopherim which belongs to this period and the first half of which is of Massoretic import makes no mention whatever of the graphic signs though it discusses the crowned letters, the majuscular letters, the verses, the sections, the dittographs &c. A striking instance of the difficulty which the compiler of this Treatise had to encounter in the explanation of certain words, due to the absence of the vowel-points may be seen in chapter IV, §§ 8, 9. Here the Divine names are described and canons are laid down for the scribes of Holy Writ with regard to these sacred appellations. Among these is the monosyllabic word which without points may either denote God or may be the particle unto. The compiler is, therefore, anxious to point out passages where it stands for the Sacred Name and where it is the particle. Among the instances which he adduces is להלך אל אל במשפט Job XXXIV 23 and he states that the first monosyllable is secular = the particle and that the second is sacred, i. e. the Divine name, God.1 It will at once be seen that, if the graphic signs had existed, there would have been no necessity whatever for this explanation. The different points unmistakably indicate this, since the particle is pointed 5, and the Divine name אָל. Moreover, he would not have been driven to use the

בתרא. במא בתרא לא קמליה: במא בתרא באמרי לא קמליה: במא בתרא בתרא בתרא בתרב: במא בתרב מונע חרבו מונע בארבב: Comp Elias Levita, Massoreth Ha-Massoreth, p. 128, ed. Ginsburg, Loudon 1867.

awkward expressions $\neg secular$, and $\neg secular$ sacred to mark the difference, for he would simply have said the first has Segol and the second $Tz\bar{e}r\bar{e}$.

The introduction of the graphic signs, however, must have taken place about a generation after the compilation of the Palaeographical Treatise Sopherim or about 650 - 680. A. D. This is to be inferred from the following facts. (1) Codex 4445 of the British Museum which contains the Pentateuch and which was written about 850 A. D. already exhibits the text with the vowel-points and accents in a highly developed form. (2) In the Massorah of this Codex, which was added about 950 A. D., the vowel-points and the accents are an integral part of this Corpus, and minute regulations are to be found on almost every page as to the points and accents of certain words which are spelled alike. A century at least must have elapsed between the introduction of the graphic signs and their becoming the object of Massoretic glosses. And (3) the same inference is to be drawn from the fact that about the middle of the ninth century the origin of the vowel-points and accents was already shrouded in darkness, and the innovation as usual, was ascribed to the sages and the Men of the Great Synagogue. Several centuries must, therefore, have elapsed before the system could thus be canonised.

As the object of inventing the vowel signs and the accents was to aid the professional teachers of Holy Writ in their function of imparting instruction to the laity in the correct pronunciation and in setting forth the traditional sense of the consonants, the Massorites did not at first confine themselves to elaborate one uniform system of graphic signs. The different Schools of Massorites formulated several systems. Hence, besides the current system according

to which the graphic signs are placed under the consonants and which is called infralinear, Massorites of other Schools developed a system which not only consists of different signs, but according to which the vowel-signs and the accents are placed above the consonants and which is, therefore, called superlinear.

The existence of the superlinear punctuation was not known till about fifty years ago. The first published notice of it was derived from the epigraph to a MS. of the Pentateuch with the Chaldee Paraphrase in the De Rossi Library No. 12 In this important document we are distinctly told that the superlinear system is that which was current in Babylon as will be seen from the following:

This Targum with its vowel-points was made from a MS. which was brought from Babylon and which had the points above according to the Assyrian system of punctuation. It was changed by R. Nathan b. Machir of Ancona son of R. Samuel b. Machir of Aveyso [in Portugal or of Aveyron in France], son of Solomon who destroyed the power of the blasphemer in Romagna by the aid of the name of the Blessed One, son of Anthos b. Zadok Ha-Nakdan. He corrected it and made it conformable to the punctuation of the Tiberian system.

That the superlinear system was the system which was current in Babylon and was called the Oriental is, moreover, corroborated by the notices of the variations between the Westerns and the Easterns which Professor Strack has collected from the various Tzufutkale MSS. The Massorah on 1 Sam. XXV 3; 2 Sam. XIII 21; Ps. CXXXVII 5 in describing the differences in the words, vowel-points and accents between these two Schools, gives the text of the passages in question according to the

י תרגום זה בנקודו נעתק מספר אשר הובא מארץ בכל והיה מנוקד למעלה בנקוד ארץ אשור והפכו ר' נתן בר מכיר מאנקונא בר שמואל בר מכיר ממדינת אויירי בנקוד ארץ אשר גדע קרן המתלוצץ בארץ רומניא בשם המבורך בר אנתום בר בר שלמה הוא אשר גדע קרן המתלוצץ בארץ והניהו ונסחו לנקוד מברני המקום וכו': Comp. Targum Onkelos, herausgegeben und erläulert von Dr. A. Berliner. Vol II, p. 134, Berlin 1884.

454

infralinear punctuation as that of the Occidentals [i. e. Maarbai, or Westerns] and according to the superlinear punctuation as that of the Orientals [i. e. Madinchai or Easterns or Babylonians].1

The Massorah, however, in describing the superlinear system as the Oriental, is not confined to the MSS. derived from the Crimea. In the Model Codex No. 1-3 in the Paris National Library, which has furnished us with so many new readings from the Oriental redaction, I have found two other Massoretic remarks to the same effect. On Levit. VII 16, where the received text or the Westerns read הקריבו with Pathach under the He, the Massorah remarks that the Eastern or Babylonians read it with Chirek and accordingly gives the variant with the superlinear punctuation.2 The same is the case in Levit. XIII 7 on the word לטהרחו for his cleansing, where the Massorah gives the Babylonian variation with the superlinear punctuation.

In the face of this evidence from different ages and separate lands it simply discloses a case of special pleading to argue that the superlinear system is not the product of the Babylonian School of Massorites. Nothing was more natural for the Babylonian authorities who had a distinct recension of the consonantal text than to formulate a system which should exhibit in graphic signs the ancient pronunciation in accordance with the traditions in their possession. The same was to be expected from the Jerusalem or Tiberian School. The two guilds of the two Schools of textual critics who elaborated these systems were not antagonistic to each other, but simply endeavoured in friendly rivalry and according to the best of their

2 הַקְרִיבוּ לֹ, הֹלְרִיבׁוּ קרן מדנֹ.

¹ Comp. A Treatise on the Accentuation by William Wickes D. D., p. 145, Oxford 1887.

ability to reproduce by graphic signs the same pronunciation of the consonants which was orally delivered to them from time immemorial. The infralinear and superlinear signs were, therefore, two trial systems to compass the same difficult task, which accounts for the fact that several modifications of the superlinear punctuation are exhibited in some MSS. Hence MSS. produced in countries outside Babylon exhibit both systems by the side of each other. A striking illustration of this fact we have in the oldest dated superlinear system exhibited in the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 916. Here the Massorah has frequently in the first part of its Massoretic gloss the first word with the infralinear punctuation and the second word in the second part of the same Massoretic remark with the superlinear punctuation;2 whilst in other passages the Massorah entirely exhibits the infralinear system.3 Ultimately, however, the Western system prevailed over its rival, just as the Western recension of the text itself has been adopted as the textus receptus and has so completely superseded its Eastern competitor that not a single copy of a purely Eastern, i. e. Babylonian recension has as yet come to light.

This final conquest is no doubt due to a great extent to the more easy and simple nature of the infralinear system. From the primitive single dot and horizontal line, the only two graphic signs which obtained prior to the introduction of the present vowel-points, the Western Massorites ingeniously developed all the vowel-signs in the infralinear system. The one dot under the consonant

¹ Comp. Orient. 1467 and Orient. 2363 in the British Museum with the St. Petersburg Codex of 916 A. D.

² Comp. Isa. I 25; II 12; VII 16; VIII 1; XXVII 11; XXXIV 5 &c. &c.

³ Comp. Isa I 19; III 7; V 2, 8; XIV 2; XVIII 6; XXIII 7 &c. &c.

(¬) is Chirek. The same dot in the middle (¬) is Shurek and above the letter (¬) is Cholem. Two dots in a horizontal position (¬) are Tzere and in a perpendicular form (¬) are Sheva. Three dots in a triangular form (¬) are Segol and in a diagonal form inclining to the right (¬) are Kibbutz. The simple horizontal line (¬) is Pathach and with the dot under it (¬) is Kametz. The composite signs Chateph-Segol, Chateph-Pathach and Chateph-Kametz are indicated by the simple addition of the two perpendicular dots to the single vowel-signs, viz. ¬, ¬.

The superlinear or Eastern system is far less simple. The signs for Kametz and Pathach which we are told are formed of broken letters are sometimes not easy to distinguish and are more difficult to write than the corresponding two signs in the infralinear system. The Shurek which consists of the letter Vav (1) occupies a very awkward position. The use of the same horizontal line (ב) to denote Raphe, the audible Sheva (שוא נע), and the quiescent Sheva (שוא נהו) is exceedingly inconvenient; and though in the variation of this system, as exhibited in Orient. 1467, this awkwardness is partly avoided by representing Raphe and \(\bar{2}\) the audible Sheva, still the quiescent Sheva is not indicated at all. This system, moreover, does not distinguish betwen Pathach and Segol and has no furtive Pathach at all. Thus for instance יריע he shall cry (Isa. XLII 13) stands for יריע. By their position the graphic signs also come inconveniently in conflict with the superlinear accents.

The solution of the tangled question as to which of the two systems is the older, or whether the one is a development of the other, or whether both have been developed simultaneously but independently of each other is outside the range of this chapter. So is an analysis of the merits and demerits of the two systems. The attempt to accomplish this would occupy a Treatise of considerable dimensions. I must, therefore, refer the student to works which discuss these points.¹

The fact that the graphic signs determine the sense of the consonants in accordance with the traditions of their predecessors the Sopherim, naturally implies that the principles, by which the authoritative custodians of the Hebrew Scriptures were guided in the redaction of the consonantal text, were faithfully followed by the Massorites who invented the vowel-points. This is fully attested by numerous passages in the Massoretic text. From these I shall only adduce a few instances which are now admitted by the best critics and expositors as having the vowel-signs in harmony with the redactorial canons of the Sopherim.

The expression "to see the face of the Lord" was deemed improper, inasmuch as it appeared too anthropomorphitic. Besides it was supposed to conflict with the declaration in Exod. XXXIII 20. Hence the Massorites in accordance with the Sopheric canon pointed the verb in the Niphal or passive in all these phrases. "To see (יִרָּאָה) the face of the Lord" was converted by the vowel-points into "to be seen" (יִרָּאָה) or "to appear before the Lord."

¹ Comp. Pinsker, Einleitung in das Babylonisch-Hebräische Punctationssystem, Vienna 1863; Ewald, Jahrbücher der Biblischen Wissenschaft 1844,
pp. 160-172; Graetz, Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des
Judenthums, Vol. XXX, p. 348-367, 395-405. Krotoschin 1881; Vol. XXXVI,
p. 425-451, 473-497. Krotoschin 1887; W. Wickes, A Treatise on the
Accentuation, p. 144 &c. Oxford 1887; Isidor Harris, in the Jewish Quarterly
Review, p. 241 &c. London 1889; G. Margoliouth, The superlinear Punctuation,
its origin &c. in the Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology,
p. 164 &c. London 1893; Bacher, Die Anfänge der Hebräischen Grammatik
in the Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, Vol. XLIX,
pp. 1-62. Leipzig 1895.

² Comp. Geiger, Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel, pp. 337-339, Breslau 1857.

But passages like Exod. XXIII 15; XXXIV 20; Isa. I 12, which are most difficult to construe with the accusative, plainly show that the natural vocalization of the verb in all these phrases is the Kal. Accordingly the proper punctuation in Exod. XXXIV 23 and Deut. XVI 16 is יְרָאֶר shall see, and not יְרָאֶר shall appear, and the passages in question are to be translated

458

Three times a year shall all thy male children see the face of the Lord.

This also shows that in the third passage where this command is repeated (Exod. XXIII 17) the original reading was אוֹר as is attested by the Samaritan recension and not as it is in the textus receptus.

The same euphemistic pointing is to be found in Exod. XXIII 15 and XXXIV 20 which ought to be translated

and ye shall not see (יראוי) my face empty handed.

This euphemism has also been introduced into Exod. XXXIV 20, and Deut. XXXI וו where לְרְאוֹת to see, the Kal infinitive is pointed לַרְאוֹת to be seen, to appear, the syncopated infinitive Niphal, a form which some of the best Grammarians do not admit. Accordingly the passages in question ought to be translated

to see the face of the Lord thy God.

That the points in לֵּרְאוֹת to appear, in Isa. I 12 are euphemistic and should be לְרָאוֹת to see, is now admitted by some of the most distinguished critics. The passage, therefore, ought to be rendered

when ye come to see my face

The same is the case in Ps. XLII 3 where מְצֶּרֶאָּה and I shall appear before, ought to be מְאָרָאָה see, and the verse is to be translated

when shall I come and see the face of God.

In the passage before us we have an instance which testifies to the oft-repeated fact that the different Schools

of textual critics followed different traditions. Thus whilst the present Massoretic text follows the School which laid down the euphemistic canon that it is to be pronounced in the passive (וֹאֶרָאָה) which is also exhibited in the Septuagint and in St. Jerome, another School of textual critics did not regard the active form or the Kal as harsh and hence adhered to the natural pronunciation (ואראה). This is attested by some MSS., the Chaldee, the Syriac, and the editio princeps of the Hagiographa, Naples 1486-87. This School recognised the fact that the phrase "to see the face of the Lord" simply denotes the Divine presence as manifested in the Sanctuary. Thus when the Psalmist assures the upright that they will enjoy spiritual communion with God, he declares

as it is rightly rendered in the Revised Version. The

great hope of the Psalmist who worships God without any prospect of material gain is

The upright shall behold his face (Ps. XI 7)

As for me I will behold thy face in righteousness (Ps. XVII 15). And Hezekiah when he expected to depart this life

expressed his distress

I shall not see the Lord, the Lord in the land of the living (Isa. XXXVIII 11).

The expression מֹלָה Molech, as it is pointed in the Massoretic text occurs eight times,1 and with one exception,2 has always the article, which undoubtedly shows that it is an appellative and denotes the king, the king-idol. The appellative signification of the word is confirmed by the Septuagint which translates it agrav prince, king, in five out of the eight instances.3 As this, however, was the

¹ Comp. Levit. XVIII 21; XX 2, 3, 4, 5; I Kings XI 7; 2 Kings XXIII 10; Jerem. XXXII 35.

² Comp. וּלְמֹלֶךְ ז Kings XI 7 which is probably a mistake in the punctuation and ought to be וְלַמֹּלֶךְ as it is in the other passages.

³ Comp. Levit. XVIII 21; XX 2, 3, 4, 5.

and, moreover, as the Jews had frequently fallen a prey to the worship of this odious king-idol with all its appalling rites of child-sacrifice, the authoritative redactors of the Hebrew text endeavoured to give a different pronunciation to these consonants when they denote this hideous image. Hence the Massorites who invented the graphic signs pointed it molech, to assimilate it to the word new shameful thing, the name with which Baal was branded.

The authoritative redactors of the text, however, simply indicated the euphemistic principle, but as in the case of Baal and other cacophanous expressions, they did not attempt to carry it through the whole Hebrew Scriptures. Hence there are passages in which the original appellative melech () is left without any alteration in the points which some of our best critics have taken to stand for Molech (). Thus for instance Isa. XXX 33 which is in the Authorised Version "yea for the king it is prepared" is translated by Professors Delitzsch, Cheyne &c.

it is also prepared for Moloch

and Dr. Payne Smith, the late Dean of Canterbury, remarks, "I have little doubt that the right vocalization of Isa. XXX 33; LVII 9 is מֹלֶדְ Molech, not מֹלֶדְ king."³

In accordance with this principle of euphemism the Massorites pointed מֵלְכֹּם Milcom, making it a proper name in three passages where this appellative occurs with the suffix third person plural instead of מֵלְכָּם their kinggod. That the Hebrew text from which the ancient Versions

¹ Comp. Numb. XXIII 21; Deut. XXXIII 5; Jerem. XXXIII 22; Ps. V 3; X 16; XXIX 10 &c.

² Vide supra, Part II, chap. XI, pp. 401-404, and Comp. Geiger, Urschrift und Uebersetzung der Bibel, pp. 299-308.

³ Comp. Bampton Lectures, p. 323 note, London 1869.

⁴ Comp. I Kings XI 5, 33; 2 Kings XXIII 13.

were made exhibited variations in these three passages is attested by the Septuagint which has Molech [= מֵלָּדְּבּ in two out of the three passages, viz. I Kings XI 5, 35.

But malcam [= מֵלְבָּם their king], with the normal

points of the suffix third person plural, occurs in at least six passages in the Massoretic text where it is taken to denote the king-idol. The modern critics, however, who admit that the king-idol = Moloch, is here intended, have advocated an alteration of the Massoretic punctuation of the expression in these passages in order to convert the appellative with the suffix into a proper name, viz. Melcam or Malcam, following the example of some of the ancient Versions. But the passage in Amos V 25 where מֵלְבֶּבֶם your king, occurs with the pronominal suffix second person, which is now recognised to mean your king-idol i. e. your Moloch, shows conclusively that there is no necessity for departing from the Massoretic punctuation of מֵלְכָּם their king-idol, with the suffix third person. However as מַלְנַכֶם vour king-idol, and מלבם are undoubtedly forms of מלד king, with the second and third persons pronominal suffix, they show that the original expression for this king-idol was מלה melech, and that in the passages where it is now מלה molech, the Massorites have assimilated the punctuation to

בּשָּׁה shame, in accordance with the ancient tradition.

Ecclesiastes III 21 exhibits another remarkable punctuation by the Massorites which is due to euphemism. The different Schools of textual critics had a different pronunciation of the He (ה) which precedes the two participles אָלָה goeth upward, and יְרֶהָה goeth downward. According to one School it was the interrogative (ה...ה)

¹ Comp. 2 Sam. XII 30 with the parallel passage in 1 Chron. XX 2;

and denotes whether it [i. e. the spirit of man] goeth

Jerem. XLIX 1, 3; Amos I 15; Zeph. I 5.

upward ... whether it [i. e. the spirit of the beast] goeth downward. This School recognised the fact that the verse before us is part of the general argument, and that the proper answer to this question is given at the end of the book. The Chaldee, the Septuagint, the Syriac, the Vulgate, Luther, the Geneva Version and the Revised Version follow this School, and take the He (7) interrogatively. Another School of redactors, however, with a sensitive regard for the devout worshippers who had to listen to the public reading of the passage, were anxious to obviate the appearance of scepticism and hence took the He (7) as the article pronoun and interpreted the clauses in question that goeth upward that goeth downward. It is this School which the Massorites followed in their punctuation of the two participles, viz. העלה...הירדת. Coverdale, the Bishops' Bible and the Authorised Version strictly exhibit the present Massoretic punctuation which as we have seen, is due to the principle of euphemism.

With the introduction of the graphic signs and their incorporation into the Massoretic Apparatus, the work of the Massorites ceased circa A. D. 700. From this guild of anonymous, patient, laborious, self-denying and godly toilers at "the hedge" which was designed henceforth to "enclose" and preserve the sacred consonantal text delivered into their keeping by their predecessors the Sopherim, the now pointed and accented text with the stupendous Massoretic corpus passed over into the hands of another guild called the Nakdanim (נקדנים) = the Punctuators or more properly the Massoretic Annotators.

Unlike the Massorites who had to invent the graphic signs, to fix the pronunciation and the sense of the consonantal text, and formulate the Lists of the correct readings in accordance with the authoritative traditions, the functions of the Nakdanim were not to create, but

CHAP. XI.]

to strictly conserve the Massoretic labours. They revised the consonantal text produced by professional copyists and furnished it with the Massoretic vowel-signs and accents, as well as with the Massorahs both Parva and Magna as transmitted to them by the Massorites.

effect each distinguished Nakdan acknowledged reputation supplied himself with a copy of the Hebrew Scriptures which he generally made himself in accordance with the Massorah and which became a Model Codex. The first Nakdanim who have produced such Model Codices and whose date we know are the two Ben-Ashers father and son, and Ben-Naphtali (circa A. D. 890-940).1 The Nakdanim also procured or compiled for themselves independent Collections of Massoretic Rubrics from which they transferred a greater or lesser quantity of these Rubrics into the Codices which they revised proportioned to the honorarium they received from the rich patron or the community for whom a Codex was made. Hence Standard Codices as well as independent Massorahs are constantly referred to by Massoretic Annotators, Jewish Grammarians and expositors from the middle of the tenth century downwards. The separate Massoretic compilations which the Nakdanim produced were designed as Manuals. They were exceedingly convenient for selecting from them the portions of the Massorah which the Massoretic Annotator had determined to transfer into the Codex he revised.

The order adopted in these Compendiums generally depended upon the taste of the compiler. As a rule, however, such an independent compilation began with the long alphabetical List of words which respectively occur twice in the Bible once without Vav (1) conjunctive and once with it. As the first pair of words in this List are

¹ Vide supra, Part II, chap. X, pp. 241-286.

אכלה eating (1 Sam. I 9), and ואכלה and eat (Gen. XXVII 19), these Manuals in accordance with the ancient Jewish practice were called Ochlah Ve-Ochlah after the words with which they begin. 1 Two such Compendiums in separate books without the regular text of the Bible are still extant in MS. The one in the Paris National Library has been published with learned notes by Frensdorff, Hanover 1864, and the other which is a far larger compilation is still in MS. in the Halle University Library. This MS. is of special interest to the Massoretic student since it belonged to the celebrated Elias Levita according to a partially defaced note on the first page and is the Ochla Ve-Ochla which he tells us Jacob b. Chayim largely used in the compilation of the Massorah in the edition of the Rabbinic Bible, Venice 1524-25.2 By the kind permission of the Halle University authorities I made a fac-simile of this MS. in 1867, and incorporated many new Massoretic Lists in my edition of the Massorah. A separate compilation of the Massorah Parva is also still extant in MS. in the Royal Library of Berlin No. 1219.

These Nakdanim or Massoretic Annotators also wrote Treatises on the vowel-points and accents as well as explanations of the Massorahitself. This independent authorship, however, opened up to the Massoretic Annotators a wide field for ingenious speculations and soon developed fine-spun theories about the vowel-points and accents which may or may not be correct, but which were never contemplated by the Massorah. The results of these theories the Massoretic Annotators frequently introduced into the Massorah itself as a constituent part of this ancient

¹ For this List see *The Massorah*, letter 1, §§ 34—53, Vol. 1, pp. 391—396.

² Comp. Massoreth Ha-Massoreth, p. 93 &c., ed. Ginsburg. London 1867

corpus either with the name of the particular authority or without it, so that in many cases it is now difficult to say which Rubric belongs to the old Massorah, and which is the product of later theorists or Grammarians. A few examples will suffice to illustrate this fact.

We have a List transmitted to us in the name of R. Phinehas, the President of the Academy at Tiberias circa A. D. 750 registering eighteen expressions in which this Massoretic Annotator substitutes Chateph-Pathach for the simple and primitive Sheva. Though these instances are adduced without giving any reason for this peculiar punctuation, an analysis of the words in question shows that the following principles underlie this proposed deviation from the Massoretic system.

- (1) When a consonant with Sheva is followed by the same consonant he changed the simple Sheva into Chateph-Pathach. This is evident from Nos. 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 in the List.
- (2) When Resh (7) stands between two Kametzes, or between a Kametz and Chirek or Shurek he changed the simple Sheva into Chateph-Pathach, as is evident from Nos. 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11 in the List.
- (3) When the copulative Vav has Shurek (1) he changed the simple Sheva into Chateph-Pathach. This is to be seen in the examples Nos. 3, 12, 13, 14 and 16 in the List. And
- (4) When nouns from the ה"ל stems have Yod (י) at the end, e. g. בכי weeping (Deut. XXXIV 8 &c.) the simple Sheva under the first consonant is changed into Chateph-Pathach. This is implied in No. 15 and in the punctuation

רכ פינחם ראש ישיבה קרי סְכֵּכִים, המשְרֵרים, וְקַרב לבו, שוְּטֵּטוּ, התמוּטְטה, בתפוּיִם, היְבשׁים, היְבשׁים, היְבשׁים, היְבשׁים, היְבשׁים, היְבשׁים, היְבשׁים, היְבשׁים, היְבשׁים, היִבשׁים, היִבשׁים היה, הְשְבע עשרה דרחבעם, יכַתְבם, ועל לבם נַשְׁלח לקראתם, אל תפּן אל קָשִי העם הזה, וּשְּבע עשרה דרחבעם, יכַתְבם, ועל לבם Comp. The Massorah, letter ב, Vol. I, p. 658, § 24.

of is a kid (Exod. XXIII 19), which is one of the instances given in another recension of R. Phinehas's List.¹

With these facts before us we shall be able to test the value of these principles, whether they have been adopted by other members of the guild of Massoretic Annotators, and how far they have been followed in the best MSS.

As regards the first principle with respect to the double consonant we have a record from another Massoretic Annotator in Orient. 1478, fol. 1b, British Museum, which is as follows:

Mnemonic sign: The Earlier ones [i. e. Massoretic Annotators] have ordained that whenever two of the same letters occur together as for instance praise ye [Jerem. XX 30 &c.]; הללו covering [Exod. XXV 20]; הללו when he prayed [Job XLII 10]; דללו they are languid [Isa. XIX 6] and all similar cases, they have Chateph-Pathach. But I have not found it so in the correct Codices.²

It will be seen that this Massoretic Annotator emphatically declares that in none of the Model Codices which he investigated was this principle followed: and I can corroborate this fact. The Standard MSS. which I have collated, as a rule have no Chateph-Pathach in these cases. Dr. Baer who quotes this identical Rubric in support of the Chateph-Pathach theory has entirely suppressed the important words of the Massoretic Annotator, but I have not found it so in the correct Codices.³ It is, moreover, to be remarked that the few Nakdanim who have espoused this

י Comp. Baer and Strack, Dikdukė Ha-Teamim, § 14, p. 15, Leipzig 1879. ביסון תקנו הקדמונים דכל תרתין אותיות דרמיין דא לדא כגון הללו מככים במן תקנו הקדמונים דכל תרתין אותיות דרמיין דא לדא כגון הללו בעד רעהו. דללו, וכל שאר בחשף פתי ולא אשכחית אנא כדין בכנפיהם, בהתפללו בעד רעהו. דללו, וכל שאר בחשף בספרים מונהים בספרים מונהים בסמן, תקנו הקדמונים דכל תרתין אותיות דרמיין דא לדא כנין הַלְלוּ, סוֹכֶכים בתח, בחשף פתח, בחשף פתח, בחשף פתח, בחשף פתח, בחשף פועד מונהים ניין בא לדא במנין בא פועדים וואר במניים בלו בעד רעהו. דְלֵלוּ וכלשאר, בחשף פתח, בהתפַּלָלוּ בעד רעהו וואר במנין בא נוכנים 1880.

principle consistently also point הְנָנִי behold me,¹ which Dr. Baer and those who follow him emphatically, though inconsistently reject.

We have also a record with regard to the second principle which affects the punctuation of the letter *Resh* (7). In the Massoretico-Grammatical Treatise which is prefixed to the Yemen Codices of the Pentateuch it is stated as follows:

Again according to some Scribes when Resh (ה) stands between two Kametzes, or between Kametz and Chirch or Shurch the Theva under it is made Chateph-Pathach, as for instance הַרְבִּילִים the goods [Gen. XIV 21 &c.]; הַרְבִּילִים the giants [Deut. III 11 &c.]; the wicked [Exod. IX 27 &c.]; הַרְבִילִים the vails [Isa. III 23].²

It will be seen that in the record before us this is simply described as a practice which obtained among a few Scribes, and is by no means represented as a rule binding upon those who are engaged in the multiplication of MSS.

As for the principle which underlies the instances adduced in the third category it may safely be stated that, with few exceptions, I have not found any Standard Codices which point the consonant with Chateph-Pathach after 1 copulative. I very much question whether any modern editor of the Hebrew Bible would be bold enough uniformly to introduce this punctuation which the statement of R. Phinehas certainly suggests. The same may be said of the principle implied in the punctuation of the nouns adduced in the fourth category.

¹ Comp. Add. 15451 British Museum, Gen. VI 17; IX 9; XLI 17: XLVIII 4 &c. &c.

יתוד למקצת הסופרים כי כל ריש אשר יהיה בין שני קמצין או בין קמץ בין קמץ יבוד למקצת הסופרים כי כל ריש אשר תחתיו כמו הֶרְיִדִים הֶרְשָׁעִים הֶרְיִדִים שהקדמנו: Comp. Orient. 2343, fol. 15a; Orient. 2349, fol. 10b; Derenbourg, Manuel du Lecteur, p. 68, Paris 1871.

The conceit of another Nakdan who formulated a rule that whenever two of the same letters occured one at the end of a word and one at the beginning of the immediately following word the latter is to have Dagesh, has already been discussed. Other Nakdanim are mentioned in Chapter XII in connection with the MSS. which they have produced and Massoretically annotated.

¹ Vide supra, Part II, chap. I, pp. 115-121.



End

of

VOLUME I